S. JUSTINI MARTYRIS

APOLOGIA PRIMA.

S. JUSTINI

PHILOSOPHI ET MARTYRIS

APOLOGIA PRIMA.

EDITED, WITH A CORRECTED TEXT AND ENGLISH INTRODUCTION AND NOTES,

BY THE REV. W. TROLLOPE, M.A.
PEMBROKE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

Ἀνὴρ οὔτε τῷ χρόνῳ πόῤῥω ὢν τῶν Ἀποστόλων, οὔτε τῇ ἀρετῇ.

Methodius *ap. Phot.*

CAMBRIDGE:
MACMILLAN, BARCLAY, & MACMILLAN.
GEORGE BELL, LONDON.

MDCCCXLV.

CAMBRIDGE:
PRINTED BY METCALFE AND PALMER, TRINITY STREET.

REVERENDO ADMODUM IN DEO PATRI

EDOUARDO MALTBY, S.T.P.

EPISCOPO DUNELMENSI, &c. &c. &c.

QUI ET IPSE

GRÆCAS LITERAS

FELICISSIME ADORNAVIT,

ET

AB ALIIS ORNATAS

BENIGNISSIME PROMOVET,

HOC

QUALECUMQUE SIT

GRATI ET MIRANTIS ANIMI

TESTIMONIUM

EO QUO DECET OBSEQUIO

D. D. D.

GULIELMUS TROLLOPE.

PREFACE.

THE Editor of the present volume had for some time been collecting materials for an edition of the genuine Works of JUSTIN MARTYR, when the *First Apology* was announced as one of the subjects selected for the Voluntary Theological Examination at Cambridge, in October next. He has therefore deemed it advisable to anticipate, if not to forego altogether, his original design; to send forth the *Apology* in a separate form; and to be determined by its reception as to the policy of completing the task which he had originally contemplated.

Among the early Christian Fathers, whose writings have lately called forth a greater degree of attention than at any former period, JUSTIN is unquestionably one of the most important; and his two Apologies are not the least valuable of his works. In this edition of the larger of the two, it has been a main object to exhibit a text approaching as near to correctness as, in the extreme dearth of MSS., can reasonably be expected. Of the few *Codices* which are known to exist, two only contain the *First Apology;* and their *Var. Lectt.* are recorded in the Notes as those of *Cod. Reg.* and *Cod. Clar.* respectively. From the former, which belongs to the Royal Library at Paris, the *Editio princeps* of Justin's work was printed by R. Stephens in 1551; and the latter, formerly in the possession of the French Jesuits, and now in a private library in

England, was first employed by the Benedictine Editor, *Prudentius Maranus*, in 1742. Of these MSS. however, as well as of the various printed copies, and other aids made use of in the present undertaking, a more formal description is reserved for a future occasion. Suffice it to observe, that, besides the variations above mentioned, the criticisms and conjectures of preceding Editors have been closely examined; and in addition to the actual emendations thence derived, such others as appeared worthy of consideration, together with a few original suggestions, have, without making any bold inroads upon the text itself, been given in the notes. These also contain a copious philological and explanatory commentary, in which is embodied a large collection of collateral testimonies from other Fathers, bearing upon the doctrine and discipline of the primitive Church.

As the work is designed for Students rather than advanced Scholars, it was at first intended to subjoin a paper of questions, similar to those which are usually proposed at University Examinations. By a glance at the *Indices*, however, which have been made very full for the purpose, it will be easy to revert to any particular subject of enquiry which may have been less deeply impressed on the memory; and the intention has accordingly been abandoned. Should the labour which has been spent in producing the volume, such as it is, be in any degree instrumental in facilitating the study of one Father, and in inducing the Student to cultivate an acquaintance with the rest, it will have had its reward.

INTRODUCTORY OBSERVATIONS

ON THE

LIFE AND WRITINGS OF JUSTIN MARTYR.

Of all the writings of the early Fathers of the Christian Church, there are none more valuable or more interesting than the Apologies which were written in defence of Christianity during the first three centuries of its progress. The few relics of this class which are still extant, are not only remarkable for their manly tone, their powerful arguments, their sarcastic energy, and their honest zeal; but for the strong light which they throw upon the nature of the struggle in which the infant Church was engaged, and the expedients to which kings and philosophers resorted in order to stifle it in its cradle. The first who thus stood forth in defence of the persecuted brethren was Quadratus, who, in the year 126, addressed an Apology to the Emperor Adrian, which is described by Eusebius as "exhibiting marks of a sound understanding and a right Apostolical division of the word of Truth."[1] His appeal was productive of the most salutary effect. An imperial rescript was immediately issued to Minucius Fundanus, the proconsul of Asia, enjoining the immediate cessation of indiscriminate persecution, and authorizing the punishment of those Christians only which could be convicted of actual crime. All that now remains is one short fragment, which affords a valuable and important testimony to the truth and reality of the miracles of Christ. "Τοῦ δὲ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν τὰ ἔργα ἀεὶ παρῆν· ἀληθῆ γὰρ ἦν· οἱ θεραπευθέντες· οἱ ἀναστάντες ἐκ νεκρῶν· οἳ οὐκ ὤφθησαν μόνον θεραπευόμενοι καὶ ἀνιστάμενοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀεὶ παρόντες· οὐδὲ ἐπιδημοῦντος μόνον τοῦ σωτῆρος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπαλλαγέντος, ἦσαν ἐπὶ χρόνον ἱκανόν· ὥστε καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἡμετέρους χρόνους τινὲς αὐτῶν ἀφίκοντο."[2]

[1] Euseb. Hist. Eccl. iv. 3. ἐξ οὗ κατιδεῖν ἔστι λαμπρὰ τεκμήρια τῆς τε τοῦ ἀνδρὸς διανοίας καὶ τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς ὀρθοτομίας. Compare 2 Tim. ii. 15.

[2] Apud. Euseb. *ubi supra.*

In conjunction with Quadratus, Eusebius and Jerome commonly mention his contemporary ARISTIDES, who also presented to Adrian an Apology for the persecuted Christians and their holy religion. Aristides was a philosopher of Athens, and so attached to the studies and habits of the schools, that, after his conversion to Christianity, he still continued to wear their peculiar dress. Not a line of his writings remain; but his Apology is said to have been conducted with great ingenuity, and to have formed the model of those which Justin afterwards presented to the Antonines. As might be expected, it was interwoven with a variety of philosophic sentiments and maxims; and we are told that it comprised a learned disquisition respecting the divinity of Christ. The earliest extant specimen of the Apologetic writings of the primitive Christians is the Appeal of Justin Martyr to Antoninus Pius: to an edition of which, now offered to the theological student, some account of the life and writings of the author may be expected as an appropriate, and indeed necessary, introduction.

The main particulars of Justin's life which have come down to posterity, are furnished by himself in his *Dialogue with Trypho*. He was born of Gentile parents, at Flavia Neapolis, in the vicinity of the ancient city of *Sychar* or *Sichem*,[3] rendered famous by our Lord's conversation with the woman of Samaria by Jacob's well. His father's name was *Priscus:* that of his grandfather, *Bacchius*.[4] In early youth he imbibed an ardent thirst for knowledge, making the nature of God and of the human soul the chief object of his research. With a view to the acquirement of a satisfactory solution of these important problems, he travelled into Egypt, and applied successively to the most eminent instructors in the several schools of philosophy at Alexandria. Sadly disappointed in the commencement of his career under the direction of a Stoic, whose lectures threw no light upon the subject of his inquiries, he proceeded forthwith to a teacher of the sect of the Peripatetics. Here he had not been long, when a stipend was demanded for his attendance; whereupon Justin left the school in disgust, and, equally in the dark as before in regard to the knowledge which he sought, would fain have joined himself to a Pythagorean philosopher of extraordinary celebrity. Dissatisfied, however, with his pupil's acquirements in *Music* and *Astronomy*, this supercilious professor refused to receive him; so that, as a last resource, he went over to the Platonists. Under a famous teacher of this persuasion he made considerable progress, and became deeply imbued with the principles of

[3] John iv. 5.

[4] Apol. I. 1. See notes *in loc*.

the sect; but still, after the most deliberate investigation of their theological system, without arriving at any fixed conclusion respecting the being and nature of the Deity. At length his attention was directed to the study of the Jewish Scriptures and of the Christian religion. As a Platonist, he could not but admire the intrepidity of the Christians in meeting death, and he had frequently been led to suppose that there must be some ground for their expectation of a future recompense.[5] Accordingly he perused the prophetic writings with candour and perseverance. His judgment and his heart were convinced and touched; he discovered that fountain of religious truth which he had long sought in vain, and gratefully acknowledged "the holy Scriptures to be the only sound and useful philosophy."[6]

The immediate cause of Justin's conversion is generally attributed to a supernatural communication from above. In his anxiety to arrive at the knowledge of the truth, it was his custom to seek the retirement of a secluded spot upon the sea-shore, with the view of pursuing his inquiries without fear of interruption. He was one day joined on his way thither by an old man of venerable appearance,[7] who entered into conversation with him, and pointed out the utter inefficiency of human philosophy, unassisted by the grace of God, to investigate his being and his attributes, to determine the immortality of the soul, or the certainty of future rewards and punishments. Awed by his appearance and convinced by his reasoning, Justin besought his advice as to the means of attaining to the knowledge of God. After directing him to *search the Scriptures*, and to pray earnestly and constantly for God's blessing upon his inquiries, and the evidence from prophecy and miracle being more particularly explained, his instructor departed, leaving him in the fixed determination of prosecuting his studies with unremitting diligence. The date of his conversion is uncertain, but it

[5] Apol. II. 12. *καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ τοῖς Πλάτωνος χαίρων διδάγμασι, διαβαλλομένους ἀκούων Χριστιανοὺς, ὁρῶν δὲ ἀφόβους πρὸς θάνατον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἄλλα νομιζόμενα φοβερὰ, ἐνενόουν ἀδύνατον εἶναι ἐν κακίᾳ καὶ φιληδονίᾳ ὑπάρχειν αὐτούς.*

[6] Dial. Tryph. c. 8. *ταύτην μόνην εὕρισκον φιλοσοφίαν ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ σύμφορον.*

[7] It has been doubted whether this venerable personage was a messenger from heaven, or some aged saint supernaturally guided to Justin's retreat. Tillemont (t. II. p. 161) advocates the first opinion; but the latter is preferable. Fabricius (Bibl. Gr. t. VII. p. 52), suggests that he may have been *Polycarp*. The historical credibility of the narrative itself is supported by many internal marks of probability; so that its rejection as a mere fiction by some modern neologians, is at once arbitrary and unphilosophical.

is generally believed to have taken place about A.D. 132 or 133, in the thirtieth year of his age.

Justin now became a zealous and powerful defender of the faith, though he still evinced considerable fondness for his former pursuits, in subservience to the support which they were calculated to afford to the religion of the Gospel. He still retained the philosophic habit,[8] and his writings are characterized by Jerome[9] as exhibiting a "learned philosophy tempered with religion." There is still extant an "Exhortation to the Greeks," which, if it be genuine, was probably written soon after his conversion, in which he contrasts the folly and falsehood of paganism with the truth of Christianity, and exposes the errors of their most celebrated philosophers, even of his favourite Plato himself, in respect to the being of a God and the soul's immortality.

Although the imperial rescript had mitigated the horrors of persecution during the reign of Adrian, still no art was left untried to render Christianity obnoxious to popular odium. Calumnies of the most gross description were circulated respecting the brethren; and the obloquy and hatred thus excited, frequently burst forth into acts of open violence. While they were designated on the one hand by the most opprobrious names, charged with the grossest immorality,[1] and stigmatized as *Atheists*,[2] for the purpose of bringing their religion into disrepute; disaffection to the government[3] was alleged against them on the other, for the sake of giving a colour to the infliction of the severest penalties which the malice of their enemies could devise. During this state of things Justin arrived in Rome;

[8] Dial. Tryph. c. 1.

[9] Catal. Script.

[1] They were called *self-murderers*, from their readiness to die for their religion; *desperate*, from their frequent exposure to the fury of wild beasts; *haters of the light*, being driven by their persecutors to offer their prayers in secret and by night. They were accused of the most licentious, and even of incestuous practices: and other terms of reproach were applied to them, such as *magicians*, *impostors*, *homines Plautinæ prosapiæ*, *pistores*, *sarmentitii*, *semaxii*, &c.; for the origin of which see *Bingham's Antiquities*, Book I. c. 2. Consult also Euseb. Hist. Eccl. VI. 19; Athenag. Legat. p. 13; Minut. Fel. pp. 75, 87; Tertull. Apol. c. 7; and Mosheim's Eccl. Hist. cent. 2.

[2] The charge of *Atheism* seems to have been the principal plea for torture and execution, when the primitive Christians were brought before the tribunals appointed by the imperial edicts. Thus Arnobius (adversus Gentes, lib. I.)—*Hoccine est, quæso, audax illud facinus et immane, propter quod vos ipsi, cum libido incesserit sæva, exuitis nos bonis, exterminatis patriis sedibus, irrogatis supplicia capitalia, torquetis, dilaceratis, exuritis, et ad extremum nos feris et belluarum laniatibus objectatis?*

[3] See Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, chap. 16.

and, indignant at the unfounded accusations against the Christians, and the cruelties to which they were exposed, addressed an "Apology" in their behalf to the Emperor Antoninus Pius. Resting his defence upon the solid test of the purity of their actions, he entreats that a rigid scrutiny may be instituted into their manner of life, and exposes the injustice of passing condemnation on them merely on account of their name and profession. Respecting the date of the Apology there is considerable difference of opinion. In the Apology itself the birth of Christ is stated, evidently in round numbers, to have been 150 years before;[4] and Tillemont, Grabe, and the Benedictine editors, have thence deduced the period at which it was written. But from several internal marks, such as the allusions to the death and deification of Antinous, the revolt of Barchochebas, and the issue of Adrian's edict against the Jews, as to events of recent occurrence, an earlier date is perhaps more probable. Dodwell supposes it to have been composed in the year 137, which is that of the accession of Antoninus to the imperial dignity; but, upon the whole, that opinion seems to be correct which assigns it to the year 139.[5]

After this act of duty to his brethren at Rome, Justin left the capital for the purpose of confirming the Christians in the provinces, and of making new converts to the faith. It is related by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. IV. 11.), that at Ephesus he had a conference with one Trypho,[6] a Jew, on the comparative merits of Judaism and Christianity. This conference he subsequently committed to writing, at the request of his friend Marcus Pompeius. Some indeed have supposed that Trypho is an imaginary personage; and that the dialogue, which never actually took place, is merely a treatise thrown into that form, as the most convenient for the purpose of refuting objections. It is certain that Justin betrays great ignorance of the Hebrew language; and the derivations which he has given of certain words would scarcely have escaped the notice of a real Jew, and been allowed to pass uncontradicted. The word Satan (Σατανᾶς), for instance, is well known to be deduced from the Hebrew שטן, *adversari*; instead of which the following occurs in the dialogue:[7] Σατανᾶς *προσηγορεῖται, ὄνομα ἀπὸ τῆς πράξεως ἧς ἔπραξε σύνθετον κτησάμενος· τὸ γὰρ* ΣΑΤΑΝ *τῇ Ἰουδαίων καὶ Συρῶν φωνῇ ἀποστάτης ἐστὶ, τὸ δὲ* ΝΑΣ *ὄνομα, ἐξ οὗ ἡ ἑρμηνεία ὄφις ἐκλήθη, ταὐτόν ἐστι* Σατᾶ *τῇ*

[4] Apol. I. 46. [5] See note on the Apology, I. 2.

[6] This *Trypho* was possibly the Rabbi Tarphon, of whom mention is frequently made in the Jewish writings, under the appellation of "*the wealthy Priest.*"

[7] Dial. Tryph. c. 103.

Ἑβραίων ἑρμηνευθείσῃ φωνῇ· ἐξ ὧν ἀμφοτέρων τῶν εἰρημένων ἓν ὄνομα γίνεται ΣΑΤΑΝΑΣ. The character of the work, moreover, bears a great affinity to the philosophical dialogues of Cicero; and has the appearance, in some places, of anticipative and meditative study, rather than of a free and conversational discourse. Still the various interruptions and digressions, and the repetition of several arguments on the second day of the conversation, for the benefit of some Jews who had not been present at its commencement, have all the appearance of reality: nor does any suspicion of a fictitious dialogue appear to have occurred to Eusebius. There is, besides, a great semblance of fact in the accident which led to the conference. As Justin was walking in the Xystus he was met by seven Jews, who, observing his philosophic robe, wished to engage him in conversation. After expressing his surprise that persons who had access to the writings of Moses and the Prophets, should have any relish for the instruction of a Greek philosopher, he adverted to the unprofitable result of his own studies, and his total failure of all inward satisfaction before his conversion to Christianity. One of the seven, who was Trypho, received this advice with courtesy, accompanied with a pretended pity for his delusion, and a recommendation to embrace Judaism as the only means of obtaining mercy from God. His companions, however, burst into a fit of laughter; and upon Justin's undertaking to demonstrate the truth of Christianity, treated him with noisy ridicule and rudeness. He was about to leave them to their ill-bred mirth, when Trypho detained him by the cloak, and entreated him to stay: to which, upon condition of becoming conduct on the part of his companions, he consented. Upon this, four of the number restrained their laughter, and the other two retiring, the debate commenced upon some stone seats in the middle of the Stadium. Being interrupted by the night, it was resumed on the morrow, with some additions to the company present.

With respect to the date of the "Dialogue with Trypho," there is a considerable difference of opinion, depending materially upon that which is assigned to the first Apology. To this Apology[8] there is a reference in the Dialogue; so that the advocates for the later or earlier composition of the former are compelled to accommodate the latter to their views. The Benedictines and others bring it down as low as A.D. 155. But, from several internal marks of time, it is

[8] Compare Apol. I. 26, with Dial. Tryph. c. 120.

more than probable that no very long interval elapsed between the appearance of the two treatises. Speaking most probably of the revolt of Barchochebas, Trypho employs the words τὸν νῦν γενόμενον πόλεμον[9]—which, if strictly interpreted, would synchronize with the reign of Adrian: and although a subsequent reference to the edict by which the Jews were expelled from Jerusalem, shews that the particle νῦν is to be taken with some limitation, any great advance to the ensuing reign can scarcely be admitted. Hence the close of the year 140 is the most probable time at which the dialogue took place; and it is reasonable to suppose that it was committed to writing at no very distant interval.

On Justin's return to Rome, he seems to have been principally occupied in resisting the spread of heresy, and in opposing the dogmas of philosophy, falsely so called. It was at this period of his life, perhaps, that he wrote his work against Heresies, and his confutation of Marcion; both of which are now lost. One thing is certain, that he was engaged in constant disputations with one Crescens, of the sect of the Cynics, whose licentious habits were no less calculated to debase the morals of the people generally, than were his ignorant and malicious aspersions against the Christians in particular, to make them the objects of popular disgust. In addition to the calumnies, however, which were invented and propagated by the heathen philosophers, there were other expedients to which they had frequent recourse, in order to oppose the progress of the religion of Christ. There was not a public calamity, and indeed scarcely a private misfortune of any illustrious individual, which was not directly or indirectly charged upon the Christians. During the reign of Marcus Antoninus, several opportunities of this nature presented themselves. In one year a great part of the city was materially injured by an inundation of the Tiber, which also produced the most disastrous effects in the adjoining villages. This misfortune was followed by a dreadful famine, by which the people were reduced to the greatest distress. In this state of affairs at home, the Carians and Lycians were visited with a severe earthquake; while a similar affliction had caused material damages at Rhodes; and a declaration of war by the Parthians had thrown the whole nation into the greatest consternation and alarm. The priests, in conjunction with the philosophers, reviled the Christians as the causes of these accumulated calamities; and affirmed that they had brought down the vengeance

[9] Dial. Tryph. c. 1.

of heaven upon the nation, by deserting the temples and neglecting the worship of the gods. Notwithstanding his superior endowments, Antoninus yielded his most ready assent to the suggestions of those sages by whom his court was thronged, and opened a most relentless persecution against the Church.[1] Among other acts of outrage, countenanced no doubt by the Emperor, Urbicus, prefect of the city, had put to death three persons, merely because they were Christians. Upon this occasion Justin drew up a most impressive defence of his fellow-sufferers; in which, as in his former Apology, he grounded their claims to justice upon the spotless purity of their lives.

It has been supposed by some, from a passage which occurs in Justin's Second Apology, that it was addressed, as well as the former, to Antoninus Pius. But although the appellation of εὐσεβὴς αὐτοκράτωρ may appear more immediately appropriate to the elder Antonine, that it was sometimes also applied to the son is proved by the inscription upon some ancient coins. We have the authority of Eusebius that Marcus Antoninus, the philosopher, is the Emperor to whom it is addressed: and from the expectation which Justin expressed,[2] that he should shortly fall a victim to the malice of Crescens, it was, in all probability, composed only a short time before his death. The date most generally assigned to it is the year 162.

However powerful were the arguments which Justin employed to awaken, if not the compassion, at least the equity, of the Emperor, they were totally unregarded by Aurelius. He still persevered in inflicting the severest punishments upon unbelievers, many of whom endured the most exquisite tortures, and even died in defence of their faith. The heroism and firmness displayed by the sufferers upon these occasions were interpreted by the Emperor into an obstinate perseverance in error and delusion.[3] As Justin had foreseen, he was not long to escape the general massacre. According to the *Acts of his Martyrdom*, he was beheaded, at the instigation of Crescens, about A.D. 165, in the seventy-sixth year of his age. Other dates have been assigned to his martyrdom. Epiphanius,[4] by an unaccountable mistake, supposes that he suffered in the year 149, at the age of thirty; but the above computation, which is that of Grabe, seems to be correct. There is also a current tradition in the Greek Church that he died by poison,

[1] See Julii Capitolini Vit. Anton. Universal History, vol. IV. (of Rome). Mosheim's Eccl. Hist. cent. 2.

[2] Apol. II. 3.

[3] M. Anton. Philos. de Seipso, lib. II. c. 3.

[4] Hær. 46.

which rests upon no authority. He met his death with that composure which, exhibited in others, had excited his admiration before his conversion, and evinced the truth of a favourite saying of his own, that *Persecution may kill, but it cannot harm.*

Eusebius[4] mentions the following works of Justin Martyr by name, together with a general reference to several others, which were in the hands of the brethren:—Two Apologies for Christianity; An Address to the Greeks; another entitled "Elenchus"; a treatise on the Monarchy of God; a work called *Psaltes;* another *On the Soul;* and the Dialogue with Trypho. He had before[5] spoken of the books against *Marcion* and against *Heresies;* to the former of which Justin himself refers in his First Apology, and the latter is mentioned by Irenæus.[6] Jerome's Catalogue[7] agrees with that of Eusebius; in addition to which he also mentions an *Exposition of the Apocalypse.*[8] Justin is also the reputed author of an Epistle to Diognetus; another to Zenas and Serenus; a Confutation of some dogmas of Aristotle; a series of Questions and Answers for the Greeks; another series for the Orthodox, which is probably identical with a *Reply to Sceptics,* otherwise lost; Questiones Græcanicæ; an Exposition of the Doctrine of the Trinity; *A Letter to the Pope; A Commentary on the Hexaëmeron;* and a *Treatise on the Resurrection of the Flesh.*

Of the works above enumerated, those which are printed in italics are not now extant; and those which are last mentioned are generally rejected as spurious, though they are annexed, in the Paris and other editions, to the genuine writings of the martyred Apologist. Cave, indeed, argues strongly in favour of the Epistle to Diognetus, whom he conjectures to have been the preceptor whom Antoninus the philosopher mentions in the work *de Seipso* (lib. I. c. 6). Neither is he willing to give up the letter to Zenas and Serenus, and the Refutation of Aristotle. But whatever doubts may be entertained with respect to the first, it is now very generally agreed that the two last of these productions were not composed by Justin; and indeed the style of the Epistle to Diognetus is so widely different from the acknowledged works of this writer, that it cannot, with any shew of reason, be included among them. It is not mentioned by Eusebius or Jerome: its quotations from the New Testament are more direct than is usual with Justin: it is more spirited in style, and more elegant in diction, and unquestionably the production, whatever may have been the

[4] Hist. Eccl. IV. 18.
[5] Hist. Eccl. IV. 11, 12, 16.
[6] Hær. IV. 14. v. 26.
[7] Vir. Ill. c. 23.
[8] Cat. Script. c. 9.

opinion of Dr. Jortin, of no inconsiderable writer. The main object of the author was the conversion of Diognetus from Paganism to Christianity; and with this view the constancy and fortitude of the Christians under persecution are set forth in the most glowing colours, as a decisive argument of the purity of their faith. According to some critics, it was composed before the fall of Jerusalem; but at the time when it was written the Christians had already suffered much from persecution. Since, however, they were still in a suffering condition, a later date than the time of Constantine cannot be assigned to it. Of the works of Justin, the two Apologies and the Dialogue with Trypho are by far the most important. The genuineness of these has never been questioned, resting, as it does, upon the concurrent testimony of a series of writers who succeeded him in the primitive Church.

It has already been stated that the first Apology was addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, about the year 140. In the title the names of Marcus Antoninus and Lucius Verus are also included, together with the senate and people of Rome. No very lucid arrangement is observed in conducting the appeal; but the main subject divides itself into three distinct parts.[a] In the first place, after intimating that those who are called *pious*, and dignified with the title of philosophers, should be really lovers of truth and equity, and discard errors, however sanctioned by custom, Justin exposes the flagrant injustice of condemning the Christians to torture and to death, merely on account of their name and profession (cc. 1–4). He admits the charge of *Atheism*, so far as the rejection of the heathen gods was concerned, but argues that those persons cannot be properly termed Atheists, who acknowledge and adore the Godhead of the Eternal Trinity (cc. 5, 6, 13, 14). Tracing the origin of the popular hatred against Christianity to the agency of evil spirits, he proceeds to obviate the absurd calumnies industriously propagated against the brethren (cc. 7–19); and appeals to the acknowledged purity of their lives as an abundant refutation of them. In opposition, more especially, to their alleged disaffection to the constituted government, he produces those precepts of the Gospel which inculcate the payment of tribute and obedience to superiors; and points to the hope of admission into a heavenly kingdom as more important in the mind of a Christian than any concern with the affairs of earthly dominion (cc. 11, 12, 18, 19). An exposition of the absurdities of polytheism is also introduced

[a] In order to a more complete analysis of the subject of the Apology, the heads of each chapter are given in the margin throughout.

(cc. 7, 22); and thence is inferred the illiberality and cruelty of interfering with the religious creed of believers, while the most glaring immoralities and follies of pagan worship are encouraged or disregarded. Under the second division, the evidence of miracle and prophecy in favour of the truth of Christianity is proposed (cc. 23–60). In regard to the former, the agency of magic in the performance of the Gospel-miracles is elaborately disproved (c. 37); and with respect to the latter, a variety of prophecies are shewn to have been already fulfilled in the person of Christ, and the reasonableness inferred of expecting the future accomplishment of those which have not yet been realized (cc. 39–53). The third part is principally occupied with a description of the Christian Sacraments, and some other rites and ceremonies of the Church (cc. 61–68), in order more effectually to demonstrate their entire harmlessness: and the author concludes with committing his cause to God, and appealing to the rescript of Adrian in favour of the Christians.

Among all the Patristical writers, the opinions of none have been more closely canvassed and more woefully misrepresented than those of Justin. Standing in the gap between the eras of Apostolical and Ecclesiastical Christianity, he has been accused of introducing innovations into the doctrines of the Primitive Church, founded upon the tenets of the Platonic philosophy. His testimonies to the preexistence and divinity of Christ are so numerous and so explicit, as to render it impossible to elude their force; and therefore modern Unitarians have varied their usual method of attack, asserting that he was the first of the ecclesiastical writers by whom they had ever been promulgated. But Justin always speaks of these essential doctrines as well known and generally received; and takes no pains to account for any apparent diversity of opinion between himself and his predecessors. Indeed, he states expressly that there were some professing Christians who affirmed that Christ was a mere man; but that with them *he did not agree*. It is true that his words have been wrested into a confession that the majority were against him; and, perhaps, as it is unquestionably involved in some obscurity, it may be advisable to produce the passage. It occurs in the Dialogue with Trypho,[2] and runs thus—Καὶ γὰρ εἰσί τινες, ὦ φίλοι, ἔλεγον, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡμετέρου γένους ὁμολογοῦντες αὐτὸν Χριστὸν εἶναι, ἄνθρωπον δὲ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων γενόμενον ἀποφαινόμενοι· οἷς οὐ συντίθεμαι· οὐδ᾽ ἂν πλεῖστοι ταῦτά μοι δοξάσαντες εἴποιεν· ἐπείδη οὐκ ἀνθρωπείοις διδάγμασι κ. τ. λ.

[2] Dial. Tryph. c. 48.

The whole difficulty rests in the last clause, in which the particle εἰ seems to have been lost before πλεῖστοι. As it now stands, the correct rendering can only be this: *With whom I do not agree; nor would the majority of those who think with me say so;* viz. that Christ is a mere man. But by reading οὐδ' ἂν εἰ πλεῖστοι κ. τ. λ. the sense will be, as expressed by Dr. Burton and others—*With whom I do not agree, nor* would I agree, *even if the majority of those who* now *think with me were to say so.* At all events, the opposition of the words τινὲς and πλεῖστοι is in itself a sufficient refutation of the Socinian inference; which is only surpassed in extravagance by that of Voltaire, who maintained, upon the authority of this same passage, that Justin was no believer *at all* in the divinity of Christ. Of course he quoted only the former part of the sentence. A reference to the opinions of the Apostolical Fathers, will amply prove that Justin was not the first propagator of the doctrine in question; of which his firm belief is maintained in numerous passages of his writings. It will here suffice to remark, that in the first Apology[3] he expressly affirms, that Christ, "*being the first-born Word of God, is also God:*" and he concludes a discussion of some length, in the Dialogue with Trypho,[4] thus—"*Now that Christ is Lord, and substantially the Son of God, has been proved by many arguments.*"

With respect to the charge of Platonizing on the doctrine of the Trinity, the merest glance at the manner in which Justin uniformly speaks of Plato and his writings, will shew that it is entirely without foundation. He unquestionably speaks of himself as "rejoicing in the doctrines of Plato" before his conversion; and he continues through life to regard his system as that which approached nearest to the truth, though he thought it nothing less than *folly* to expect to arrive by it at the knowledge of God.[5] His predilection for his favourite philosopher has given perhaps a character to some of his expressions; and he has quoted several passages from his writings in illustration of the Gospel doctrines; remarking, however, at the same time, upon the infinite superiority of the Gospel scheme.[6] Instead of borrowing from Plato any of the doctrines of Christianity, he affirms positively that many of Plato's statements were borrowed from Moses; and it is obvious that the opinions of Plato, which seem to bear any resemblance, however remote, to the revelations of the Gospel, are alleged, with more of zeal than prudence, to remove

[3] Apol. I. c. 63.
[4] Dial. Tryph. c. 128.
[5] Apol. II. 12.
[6] Compare Apol. I. 20; II. 13.

the objections which had been raised against the latter on the score of recent invention. With the same intention of recommending Christianity to the heathen, he has accommodated Orpheus to the Bible in the *Exhortation to the Greeks*:[7] and we have no better proof that he extracted from Plato the doctrine of the Trinity, than that he was furnished by Orpheus with a history of the Creation.[8]

Justin is a rambling and desultory writer; so much so, that his argument is frequently involved in considerable obscurity. At the same time his style is bold and perspicuous; and his language, though not elegant, appropriate and correct. It will be observed, that the Gospel precepts are not always given with strict regard to verbal accuracy; a circumstance which has been introduced into the question, *whether Justin quoted from the Gospels which we now have?* The reader will find this point discussed at large in Lardner's Credibility, Bishop Marsh's Dissertation, and Bishop Kaye's Account of the Writings and Opinions of this Father. Indeed, in the pursuit of his inquiries into the writings and opinions of Justin Martyr, the student's attention should be particularly directed to the last-named masterly publication. From a confidence that no one would think of entering upon the study of this Father without this indispensable guide, the preceding observations have been somewhat more brief than would otherwise have been deemed requisite; and his opinions respecting original sin, free-will, grace, justification, predestination, baptism, the eucharist, the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the millennium, future judgment, angels, and demons, have been left almost entirely in the hands of the learned Prelate. After what he has said on these subjects, any lengthened discussion of them would be more than superfluous.

[7] Cohort. ad Græc. c. 15.

[8] See Burton's "Bampton Lectures," Note 90, p. 542.

ΤΟΥ ΑΓΙΟΥ

ΙΟΥΣΤΙΝΟΥ

ΑΠΟΛΟΓΙΑ ΠΡΩΤΗ ΥΠΕΡ ΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΩΝ

ΠΡΟΣ

ΑΝΤΩΝΙΝΟΝ ΤΟΝ ΕΥΣΕΒΗ.

I. Αὐτοκράτορι Τίτῳ Αἰλίῳ Ἀδριανῷ Ἀντωνίνῳ Εὐσεβεῖ Σεβαστῷ Καίσαρι, καὶ Οὐηρισσίμῳ υἱῷ φιλοσόφῳ, καὶ Λουκίῳ

Addressing the Emperor Antoninus Pius, and his adopted sons, and professing his adherence to Christianity,

INSCR. ΤΟΥ ΑΓ. ΙΟΥΣΤ. ΑΠ. So Cod. Reg. and Ed. Steph. Some omit ἁγίου, and others read ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν, adding, with reference to the twofold character of Justin's career, Φιλοσόφου καὶ Μάρτυρος.—ΠΡΩΤΗ. MSS. and Edd. Steph. Sylb. Mor. δευτέρα. Later Editors have changed the epigraph, and inverted the order of the two Apologies; and it will appear that they are right in so doing from Euseb. Hist. Eccl. IV. 8. Compare Apol. I. 1, 11, 12, 18, 26, 29, 31. See Phot. Bibl. c. 125, p. 94.—ΠΡΟΣ ΑΝΤ. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. IV. 11. Ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς οὗτος Ἰουστῖνος, καὶ πρὸς Ἕλληνας ἱκανώτατα πονήσας, καὶ ἑτέρους λόγους ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡμετέρας πίστεως ἀπολογίαν ἔχοντας βασιλεῖ Ἀντωνίνῳ τῷ δὴ ἐπικληθέντι Εὐσεβεῖ, καὶ τῇ Ῥωμαίων συγκλήτῳ βουλῇ, προσφωνεῖ. Καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς Ῥώμης τὰς διατριβὰς ἐποιεῖτο. Ἐμφαίνει δὲ ἑαυτὸν ὅστις καὶ πόθεν ἦν, διὰ τῆς ἀπολογίας ἐν τούτοις. Of the preposition πρὸς with an *accus.* in inscriptions, see Wolf's Proleg. in Demosth. c. Leptin. and Muret. Var. Lect. VII. p. 74.

I. 1. Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. IV. 12) cites this exordium at length, and adds, ἐντευχθεὶς δὲ καὶ ὑφ' ἑτέρων ὁ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας ἀδελφῶν, παντοίαις ὕβρεσι πρὸς τῶν ἐπιχωρίων δήμων καταπονουμένων, τοιαύτης ἠξίωσε τὸ κοινὸν τῆς Ἀσίας διατάξεως. It should seem then, that the rescript to the Common Assembly of Asia, if rightly attributed to Antoninus Pius, was written in consequence of certain expostulations from the Asiatics themselves; and was not, as some have supposed, produced by the Appeal of Justin. There are some trifling variations in the citation of Eusebius, which will be duly recorded.

2. Σεβ. Καίσαρι. Euseb. Καίσαρι Σεβ. The epithet Σεβαστὸς is the Hellenistic synonym of *Augustus*, the title borne by all the Roman Emperors from Octavian downwards, who received it, according to Philo (Leg. ad Cai. p. 1012. D.), ὡς γενόμενος ἀρχὴ σεβασμοῦ καὶ τοῖς ἔπειτα. But see Sueton. Aug. c. 7. St. Luke uses Σεβαστὸς in the Acts (xxv. 21), but Αὐγουστὸς in his Gospel (ii. 1).—

φιλοσόφῳ Καίσαρος φύσει υἱῷ καὶ Εὐσεβοῦς εἰσποιήτῳ, ἐραστῇ παιδείας, ἱερᾷ τε συγκλήτῳ καὶ δήμῳ παντὶ Ῥωμαίων

Edd. Bened. and Br. incorrectly omit the copula before Οὐηρισσίμῳ: and Sylb. and others would read, by transposition, καὶ Καίσαρι, or insert a second Καίσαρι before Οὐηρ. It is clear that in the time of Eusebius the exordium stood as we have it now; and not only is there neither reason nor authority for the change proposed, but the received text, viewed in connexion with the relation of the individuals to whom it is addressed, seems to fix with the utmost precision the date of the Apology. After the death of *Lucius Ælius Verus*, whom Adrian had adopted by the title of *Ælius Verus Cæsar*, that Emperor supplied his loss by the adoption of *Titus Aurelius Antoninus* as his successor, whom he immediately (A. D. 138) admitted into a share of the empire by the title of *Titus Ælius Adrianus Antoninus Cæsar*. The title of *Augustus* was shortly afterwards added; and that of *Pius*, which has been supposed to have originated in the virtues for which he was generally distinguished, seems rather to have risen out of that anxious and affectionate solicitude, with which he obtained for Adrian those customary obsequies which the outraged senate had resolved to withhold. Having at the time of his adoption no male issue, Adrian required him to adopt *M. Annius Verus*, the son of his wife's brother, and *Lucius Verus*, the son of the above-named *L. Ælius Verus*. Of these two individuals, the former was an especial favourite with the Emperor, who was wont to address him, with affectionate playfulness, as *Verissimus* instead of *Verus;* and thus he is here named, as well as the *Philosopher*, by which title, in consequence of his devotion to literature and philosophy, he has ever been distinguished. Within a few months after these arrangements, Adrian died; in the following year (A.D. 139) Marcus received the appellation of *Cæsar*, and in the year 140 was admitted to a participation of the imperial dignity. It was therefore early in the year 139, before Aurelius had been complimented with the name of Cæsar, and while he was yet distinguished only by the distinctive term φιλόσοφος, that Justin's Apology was written. Neither is it a valid objection to this date, that L. Verus, being then only eight years of age, could not be likewise appropriately styled φιλόσοφος, however suitable might be the term παιδείας ἐραστής. Now it so happens that the printed editions, and one or two MSS. of Eusebius, instead of φιλοσόφῳ, read φιλοσόφου; so that the title would thus belong, not to the child, but to his natural father, *Ælius Verus*. To this reading, however, the objections seem to be insuperable. Not only are the MSS. of Justin, and four of those of Eusebius, in favour of the common text; but, independently of the probability that a complimentary title would be given to a living prince rather than his deceased father, it does not appear that the latter was in any way remarkable for his studious propensities. That the extreme youth of Lucius would be no bar against his reception of the title, is, on the other hand, abundantly proved; for Capitolinus (Vit. M. Ant. c. 2.) relates of the elder of the adopted brothers, that *philosophiæ operam vehementer dedit, et quidem adhuc puer: nam* duodecimum *annum ingressus habitum philosophiæ assumpsit.* Speaking also of Lucius himself, the same writer (Vit. L. Ver. c. 2) says that *amavit* in pueritiâ *versus facere, post orationes, et melior quidem orator fuisse dicitur quam poeta; imo, ut verius dicam, pejor poeta quam rhetor; nec desunt qui dicant, eum fuisse adjutum ingenio amicorum, atque ab aliis ei illa, qualiacunque sint, scripta; siquidem multos disertos*

ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐκ παντὸς γένους ἀνθρώπων ἀδίκως μισουμένων καὶ ἐπηρεαζομένων, Ἰουστῖνος Πρίσκου τοῦ Βακχείου, τῶν ἀπὸ Φλαουΐας νέας πόλεως τῆς Συρίας Παλαιστίνης, εἷς αὐτῶν ὢν τὴν προσφώνησιν καὶ ἔντευξιν πεποίημαι.

et eruditos semper secum habuisse dicitur. Add to this, that in Justin's second Apology (c. 2), this same Lucian is designated φιλοσόφῳ Καίσαρος παιδί. In like manner also, Athenagoras addressed his Apology to M. Aurelius and Lucius Ælius *the Philosophers.*

4. δήμῳ παντί. Euseb. παντὶ δήμῳ.

5. ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐκ. π. γ. ἀνθρώπων. *In behalf of those of all nations, who, &c. Grabe* confirms this meaning of the expression by the testimony of Justin himself (Dial. Tryph. c. 117), that οὐδὲ ἕν ὅλως ἐστι τὸ γένος ἀνθρώπων, among whom there were not some who professed Christianity, and by the consequent fulfilment of our Lord's prophecy in Matth. xxiv. 9, ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου. In proof of the *hostilia et furiosa odia* exercised against the early Christians, see Tertul. Apol. I. 1; Adv. Nat. I. 1; Epist. Lugd. ap. Euseb. v. 1; Origen. c. Cels. I.; Lactant. Inst. v. 9. The verb ἐπηρεάζειν is doubtless here borrowed from the precept of our Lord in Matth. v. 44. Various significations have been there assigned to it by the Commentators; but probably it will be best interpreted to denote that species of *malevolence,* which seeks to *injure* or *annoy* a *person* in the mere spirit of ill-will, without any idea of deriving any advantage by so doing. Such is the import affixed to it in Aristot. Rhet. II. 2, ἔστι γὰρ ὁ ἐπηρεασμὸς ἐμποδισμὸς ταῖς βουλήσεσιν, οὐχ ἵνα τι αὐτῷ, ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ ἐκείνῳ. Compare Herod. v. 9; Philostr. VIII. 4; Herodian, II. 4, 16; Joseph. Ant. XVI. 4; 1 Pet. iii. 16: and see Wasse on Thucyd. I. 26.

6. Βακχείου. Thirlby would read Βακχίου, as in *Nicephorus.* Photius (Bibl. c. 25.) adopts the mistake of Jerome (Vir. Ill. c. 23), that the name of Justin's father was *Priscus Bacchius.* It is clear that the insertion of the article settles the matter at once. Valesius, indeed, in his notes on Eusebius, long since corrected the error. The version of Rufinus is, *Justinus Prisci filius Bacchiadis.*

7. Φλαουΐας νέας πόλεως τῆς Σ. Π. *Flavia Neapolis,* so called from the colony sent thither by Flavius Vespasian, was not the ancient *Sychar* (John iv. 5), as inaccurately stated, after Jerome, by Stephanus Byzantinus; but literally, as the name imports, a *new town,* built near the ruins of that memorable place. Euseb. Onomast. Συχὲμ, πόλις Ἰακώβ, νῦν ἔρημος· δείκνυται δὲ ὁ τόπος ἐν προαστείοις Νέας πόλεως. It was formerly called *Mamortha.* The modern name is *Naplous.* See Joseph. Ant. II. 2, 4, v. 7, 2; XI. 8, 6, B. I. IV. 8, 1; Plin. H. N. v. 13, 14.—Eusebius has Συρίας τῆς Παλ.; but the MSS. vary. Sylburg repeats the article. In point of fact it might be absent altogether; and thus the coins exhibit ΦΑ. Ν. Π. ΣΥΡ. Π.

8. εἷς αὐτῶν ὤν. *I,* Justin, *being one of them;* i.e. of the hated sect. The participle, which seems to have been passed over from its similarity to the ending of the preceding word αὐτῶν, has been judiciously restored from Eusebius, by Thalemann and Otto, at the suggestion of Grabe.—There seems here to be a distinction between the terms προσφώνησις, *an address spoken,* and ἔντευξις, *a written petition.* Artemid. v. 17, ἐντυχὼν τῷ βασιλεῖ ἀφείθη τῆς ἀγγαρείας. Such a petition was presented by the Arians to Jovinian against Athanasius, beginning

istin points it to them iat their imes and ation de- and from em a due gard to uth and luity.

II. Τοὺς κατ' ἀλήθειαν εὐσεβεῖς καὶ φιλοσόφους μόνον τἀληθὲς τιμᾶν καὶ στέργειν ὁ λόγος ὑπαγορεύει, παραιτουμένους δόξαις παλαιῶν ἐξακολουθεῖν, ἂν φαῦλαι ὦσιν· οὐ γὰρ μόνον μὴ ἕπεσθαι τοῖς ἀδίκως τι πράξασιν ἢ δογματίσασιν ὁ σώφρων λόγος ὑπαγορεύει, ἀλλ' ἐκ παντὸς τρόπου καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ψυχῆς τὸν φιλαλήθη, κἂν θάνατος ἀπειλῆται, τὰ δίκαια λέγειν τε καὶ πράττειν αἱρεῖσθαι δεῖ. Ὑμεῖς μὲν οὖν ὅτι λέγεσθε εὐσεβεῖς καὶ φιλόσοφοι, καὶ φύλακες δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἐρασταὶ παιδείας, ἀκούετε πανταχοῦ· εἰ δὲ καὶ ὑπάρχετε, δειχθήσεται. Οὐ γὰρ κολακεύσοντες ὑμᾶς διὰ τῶνδε τῶν γραμμάτων, οὐδὲ πρὸς χάριν ὁμιλήσοντες, ἀλλ'

with the words δεόμεθά σου τοῦ κράτους (ap. Athanas. Op. t. II.). See Vales. ad Euseb. Hist. Eccl. IV. 12. Hence in c. 2, διὰ τῶνδε τῶν γραμμάτων. It has been doubted whether the Apologies were ever designed for public presentation, upon the ground that they are too plain-spoken, and free from expressions of adulation and servility; but, setting aside their truth and earnestness both of style and manner, (of which see Tscherner's *Fall des Heidenthums*, I. 209), even the grammatical construction is evidence, almost conclusive, of the fact. With an elegant *hystero-proteron* in the order of the nouns προσφώνησιν and ἔντευξιν, and giving full force to the perfect πεποίημαι, the sense will be this, *I have prepared this address, and am* now *presenting the petition.* See Buttm. Gr. Gram. § 137. Eusebius indeed gives ποιοῦμαι, but incorrectly. Compare c. 68, infra. The phrase ἔντευξιν ποιεῖσθαι is analogous to λόγον ποιεῖσθαι (Diog. L. VII. 1, 21; Ach. I. 1, 7); and the use of the *perf. pass.* for the *perf. mid.* is not unusual in those verbs, of which the regular middle form is wanting or incomplete.

II. 1. τοὺς κατ' ἀληθείαν κ. τ. λ. This first sentence is cited, with some variations of reading, by *Joannes Damascenus*, in his *Sacr. Parallel.* p. 753. With the exception, however, of the transposition of the words πράττειν τε καὶ λέγειν, these variations are unimportant; viz. πολλῶν for παλαιῶν, the omission of μόνον, and the insertion of the article before θάνατος.

8. ὅτι λέγεσθε. H. Steph. would cancel these words, on the supposition that they found their way into the text from the margin of some copy in which a gloss, ὅ ἐστι λέγεσθε, had been written in explanation of the sense which ἀκούετε, by itself, would bear. Hermann (Misc. Lips. Nov. III. p. 224) proposes to reject ὅτι only, so that λέγεσθε may take in the former predicates; and ἀκούετε belong to ἐρασταὶ παιδείας alone. Thirlby would read ἐπιλέγεσθε, and Otto conjectures οἶδ' ὅτι in the place of οὖν ὅτι. Not to be outdone in guesses, perhaps λέγετε ὅτι may take its place with the rest. Justin, however, did not always study the niceties and accuracies of diction; and the received text stands, in all probability, precisely as he wrote it.

10. δειχθήσεται. *Scil.* by the event. It will be proved by the effect which this appeal to your justice produces, whether you are really εὐσεβεῖς. Upon what grounds H. Steph. would read δείξετε, it is difficult to conceive.

11. διὰ τῶνδε τῶν γραμμάτων. The γράμματα and ὁμιλία are here united, as the προσφώνησις and ἔντευξις above; and this consideration is alone sufficient

ἀπαιτήσοντες κατὰ τὸν ἀκριβῆ καὶ ἐξεταστικὸν λόγον τὴν κρίσιν ποιήσασθαι, προσεληλύθειμεν, μὴ προλήψει μηδ' ἀνθρωπαρεσκείᾳ τῇ· δεισιδαιμόνων κατεχομένους, ἢ ἀλόγῳ ὁρμῇ καὶ χρονίᾳ προκατεσχηκυίᾳ φήμῃ κακῇ τὴν καθ' ἑαυτῶν ψῆφον φέροντας. Ἡμεῖς μὲν γὰρ πρὸς οὐδενὸς πείσεσθαί τι κακὸν δύνασθαι λελογίσμεθα, ἢν μὴ κακίας ἐργάται ἐλεγχώμεθα, ἢ πονηροὶ διεγνώσμεθα· ὑμεῖς δ' ἀποκτεῖναι μὲν δύνασθε, βλάψαι δ' οὔ.

III. Ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ ἄλογον φωνὴν καὶ τολμηρὰν δόξῃ τις ταῦτα εἶναι, ἀξιοῦμεν τὰ κατηγορούμενα αὐτῶν ἐξετάζεσθαι, καὶ, ἐὰν οὕτως ἔχοντα ἀποδεικνύωνται, κολάζεσθαι ὡς πρέ-

He demands a fair investigation into the conduct of the Christians, according to the established principles of ordinary justice;

to set aside Sylburg's conjecture *προσαγορευμάτων*, suggested by the marginal reading *πραγμάτων*, which is found in the MSS.

12. *ἀκριβῆ καὶ ἐξεταστικόν.* For *ἀκριβῶς*. The phrase *ἀκριβῶς ἐξετάζειν* is commonly applied to the *accurate investigation* of any matter. So Demosth. adv. Lept. p. 364, *εἰ δέ τις αὐτὸ ἀκριβῶς ἐξετάσειε.* Polyb. v. 81. 7, *διὰ τὸ μὴ καλῶς ἐξητακέναι.* Matt. ii. 8, *ἀκριβῶς ἐξετάσατε περὶ τοῦ παιδίου.*

13. *προσεληλύθειμεν.* Braunius, after Sylb. and Thalemann, maintains that the perfect *προσεληλύθαμεν* is more agreeable to the sense; but, as Otto has hinted, the variation of tense, which almost immediately occurs, in the verbs *ἐλεγχώμεθα* and *διεγνώσμεθα*, proves that Justin was not so strictly observant of grammatical exactness as to justify any alteration in the text.—*μὴ προλήψει κ. τ. λ.* Render, ***not biassed by a desire of pleasing superstitious men, by irrational impulse, or by evil rumours which have long been prevalent.*** Athenagoras also set out with a similar request in his Legat. pro Christ. c. 2, *ἀναγκαῖον δέ μοι ἀρχομένῳ ἀπολογεῖσθαι ὑπὲρ τοῦ λόγου, δεηθῆναι ὑμῶν, μέγιστοι αὐτοκράτορες, ἴσως ἡμῖν ἀκροατὰς γίνεσθαι, καὶ μὴ τῇ κακῇ καὶ ἀλόγῳ φήμῃ συναπενεχθέντας προκατασχεθῆναι.* Compare also Theophil. ad Autol. III. 4. The word *ἀνθρωπαρεσκεία*, which the Cod. Par. writes *ἀνθρωποπαρεσκεία*, is an Hellenistic compound of very rare occurrence, signifying *an over-readiness to please men;* to please them, that is, rather than God. See Suiceri Thes. in v. Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 613. The adjective *ἀνθρωπαρεσκοὶ* is found in Ephes. vi. 6.

19. *βλάψαι δ' οὔ.* Augustin. Epist. 146: *Sæpe nihil nocet ei qui patitur injuriam: ei autem, qui facit, necesse est ut noceat. Quid enim nocuit Martyribus iniquitas persequentium? Ipsis autem persecutoribus plurimum.* It has been frequently remarked that Justin had his eye upon the saying of Socrates recorded in Plat. Apol. p. 30. c. (ed. Steph.):—*ἐμὲ μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲν ἂν βλάψειεν οὔτε Μέλιτος οὔτε Ἄνυτος· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν δύναιντο κ. τ. λ.* The saying is also referred to by Clement of Alexandria (Strom. IV. p. 505), Origen (c. Cels. VIII.), Arrian (Epict. II. 2), and others. See Davis ad Cic. N. D. p. 292.

III. 2. *αὐτῶν.* That is, *the Christians,* who were last spoken of in the first person. Such transitions are among the anomalies of Justin's style, of the imperfections of which he was not himself unconscious. See Cohort. ad Gr. c. 35; Dial. c. Tryph. c. 58.

3. *κολάζεσθαι ὡς πρέπον ἐστί.* Here again there is a change, not indeed of

πον ἐστὶ, μᾶλλον δὲ κολάζειν· εἰ δὲ μηδὲν ἔχοι τις ἐλέγχειν, οὐχ ὑπαγορεύει ὁ ἀληθὴς λόγος διὰ φήμην πονηρὰν ἀναιτίους ἀνθρώπους ἀδικεῖν, μᾶλλον δὲ ἑαυτοὺς, οἳ οὐ κρίσει ἀλλὰ πάθει τὰ πράγματα ἐπάγειν ἀξιοῦτε. Καλὴν δὲ καὶ μόνην δικαίαν πρόκλησιν ταύτην πᾶς ὁ σωφρονῶν ἀπο-

person, but of *subject;* and *αὑτοὺς*, not *τὰ κατηγορούμενα*, must be supplied. The Greeks said *κολάζειν τινα*, not *κολάζειν τι.* There is a passage in every respect similar in the end of c. 16: *κολάζεσθαι δὲ τοὺς οὐκ ἀκολούθως τοῖς διδάγμασιν αὐτοῦ βιοῦντας, λεγομένους δὲ μόνον Χριστιανοὺς, καὶ ὑφ' ὑμῶν ἀξοιῦμεν.* With respect to the appended clause, *μᾶλλον δὲ κολάζειν*, the critics have been sorely at fault to know what to do with it. Otto, at the suggestion of Thirlby, has expunged it altogether, supposing it to be nothing more than a casual observation of some reader, who, mistaking the passive import of *κολάζεσθαι*, wrote *μᾶλλον κολάζειν* in the margin; whence it crept into the text, with the particle *δὲ* inserted in order to produce a connexion in the sense. The manifest improbability of this notion luckily saves the credit of the supposed scribbler. At the same time, there seems to be little doubt that the copula has been introduced to make something of a corrupt passage; and yet even thus, of the interpretations offered, that alone which merits a moment's attention is the very unsatisfactory one of Fabricius. It is to the following effect: *If the charges against the Christians can be substantiated, we are willing that they should be punished as they deserve, or rather to punish them ourselves.* The Benedictine editor, Maranus, seems to have given the clue to the true reading; and it is strange that he should not have perceived the unnatural position of the particle *δὲ* in his proposed emendation. He reads and points thus: *κολάζεσθαι, ὡς πρέπον ἐστὶν ἄλλον δὲ κολάζειν.* Conjecture might well have carried him a trifle farther: *ὡς πρέπον ἐστὶ καὶ ἄλλον κολάζειν.* With respect to the demand itself, Justin is followed by Athenagoras, in Legat. c. 2: *εἰ μέν τις ἡμᾶς ἐλέγχειν ἔχει ἢ μικρὸν ἢ μεῖζον ἀδικοῦντας, κολάζεσθαι οὐ παραιτούμεθα, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἥτις πικροτάτη καὶ ἀνηλεὴς τιμωρία, ὑπέχειν ἀξιοῦμεν.* Comp. Melito ap. Euseb. H.E. IV. 26. Tertul. Apol. cc. 4, 7; ad Nat. I. 2. That there was reason for the demand, see Pliu. Epist. x. 97. Perhaps it is scarcely worth while to notice the conjecture of Sylburg, founded upon the above citation from Athenagoras; but all the commentators record it, and it were a pity to be out of fashion. For a guess, *μᾶλλον δὲ κολάζεσθαι πικρότερον* may do, and it will do for nothing else.

7. *ου κρίσει, ἀλλὰ πάθει.* Under the influence, not of *judgment*, but of *passion.* This is more particularly an Hellenistic sense of *πάθος*. The expression *τὰ πράγματα ἐπάγειν* is analogous to *κίνδυνον ἐπάγειν*, and the like; and signifies *to cause trouble* or *molestation.* 'Tis pity that critics will not *leave well alone*, as if there was not enough that is wrong to exercise their ingenuity. Somebody would here read *ἐτάζειν*, which should be *ἐξετάζειν*, for *ἐπάγειν.* This is bad; and therefore Otto, against his own judgment, suggests *ὑπάγειν*, which is worse. Surely critical conjecture has something of the nature of a *pun*,—the further you hunt it, the harder it runs, till it is lost at last in a thicket of absurdity.

8. *καλὴν καὶ μ. δ. πρόκλησιν.* *The only fair and equitable adjustment.* In a *forensic* sense, *πρόκλησις* is an offer of terms by either party, with a view to bring the matter in dispute to a speedy issue. See Demad. 138, 13; 978, 8. It thus gives a better sense than *πρόσκλησιν*, a summons, which Thirlby would substitute.

φανεῖται, τὸ τοὺς ἀρχομένους τὴν εὐθύνην τοῦ ἑαυτῶν. βίου καὶ λόγου ἄληπτον παρέχειν· ὁμοίως δ' αὖ καὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας μὴ βίᾳ μηδὲ τυραννίδι, ἀλλ' εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ φιλοσοφίᾳ ἀκολουθοῦντας, τὴν ψῆφον τίθεσθαι. Οὕτως γὰρ ἂν καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες καὶ οἱ ἀρχόμενοι ἀπολαύοιεν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ. Ἔφη γάρ που καί τις τῶν παλαιῶν· Ἂν μὴ οἱ ἄρχοντες φιλοσοφήσωσι καὶ οἱ ἀρχόμενοι, οὐκ ἂν εἴη τὰς πόλεις εὐδαιμονῆσαι. Ἡμέτερον οὖν ἔργον, καὶ βίου καὶ μαθημάτων τὴν ἐπίσκεψιν πᾶσι παρέχειν, μήπως ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀγνοεῖν τὰ ἡμέτερα νομιζόντων, τὴν τιμωρίαν, ὧν ἂν πλημμελῶσι τυφλώττοντες αὐτῶν, αὐτοῖς ὀφλήσωμεν· ὑμέτερον δὲ, ὡς αἱρεῖ λόγος, ἀκούοντας ἀγαθοὺς εὑρίσκεσθαι κριτάς. Ἀναπολόγητον γὰρ λοιπὸν μαθοῦσιν, ἢν μὴ τὰ δίκαια ποιήσητε, ὑπάρξει πρὸς Θεόν.

10. τοὺς ἄρχοντας μὴ βίᾳ κ. τ. λ. Braunius compares Isocr. de Pace, c. 24, τῶν μὲν γὰρ ἀρχόντων ἔργον ἐστὶ τοὺς ἀρχομένους ταῖς αὐτῶν ἐπιμελείαις ποιεῖν εὐδαιμονεστέρους. Of the phrase ψῆφον τίθεσθαι, see Buttmann. ad Soph. Philoct. 1448. On the same passage Mitchell asks, "*But did not the Greeks say* τιθέναι ψῆφον?" Yes; but not exclusively. Both forms were used, just as they said both νόμον τιθέναι and νόμον τίθεσθαι. Compare Lysias pro Inval. p. 170, 24; Demad. p. 178, 31.

14. τις τῶν παλαιῶν. Plato de Republ. v. 18. See Ast *ad loc.* It seems that the maxim was a favourite one with both the Antonines; so that it was a neat stroke of policy in Justin to quote it. See Aur. Vict. H. R. p. 258; J. Capitolin. in Vit. M. Ant. c. 27. Since however Plato is speaking of rulers only, Thalemann would reject the words καὶ οἱ ἀρχόμενοι as spurious. It was suggested by H. Steph. that Plato is not the author quoted: but may not Justin have purposely modelled the *dictum* of the philosopher to suit his argument?

17. μήπως ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀγνοεῖν κ. τ. λ. *Vulgo*, ὅπως. Now as this gives a sense precisely opposite to that which the context requires, there can be no possible objection against admitting into the text the emendation of Thirlby, which is clearly preferable to the insertion of μὴ after ὅπως, which had been previously suggested. Still the passage is not freed from manifest corruption. Otto indeed affirms that the text may stand without emendation; but he does not vouchsafe his aid in making it intelligible. Now the error clearly lies in the pronouns αὐτῶν and αὐτοῖς. The Benedictine editor renders τυφλώττοντες αὐτῶν, *qui ex iis* sive *inter illos cæcutiunt:* but this would require the insertion of the article with τυφλώττοντες. Thirlby rejects αὐτῶν. Grabe for αὐτοῖς reads αὐτοί. Without venturing a change in the text, the following emendation may be allowed to find a place in the notes: μήπως, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀγν. τὰ ἡμ. νομιζόντων, τὴν τιμωρίαν, ὧν ἂν πλ. τυφλώττοντες, αὐτῶς αὐτοὶ ὀφλήσωμεν. Justin meant to say that the Christians submitted their conduct to general enquiry, *lest, by conniving at the wilful ignorance of their enemies, they should needlessly* (αὐτῶς, frustra) *incur a share in the punishment due to those errors which were the result of mental blindness.* The

And points out the iniquity of punishing them merely for the name they bear; and making the immoralities of a few individuals a cause of reproach against the entire body.

IV. Ὀνόματος μὲν οὖν προσωνυμία οὔτε ἀγαθὸν οὔτε κακὸν κρίνεται ἄνευ τῶν ὑποπιπτουσῶν τῷ ὀνόματι πράξεων· ἐπεί, ὅσον γε ἐκ τοῦ κατηγορουμένου ἡμῶν ὀνόματος, χρηστότατοι ὑπάρχομεν. Ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ οὐ τοῦτο δίκαιον ἡγούμεθα, διὰ τὸ ὄνομα, ἐὰν κακοὶ ἐλεγχώμεθα, αἰτεῖν ἀφίεσθαι, πάλιν, εἰ μηδὲν διά τε τὴν προσηγορίαν τοῦ ὀνόματος καὶ διὰ

verb τυφλώττω is *a neuter-passive*, of similar form with ὀνειρώττω, λιμώττω, and the like.

IV. 1. προσωνυμία. The Edd. and MSS. have προσωνυμίᾳ in the *dative*. Grabe perceived that the nominative was required; but neither he nor subsequent editors have ventured to disturb the text. This delicacy, which shrinks from the removal of a poor *iota subscriptum*, would scarcely have stood in the way of some hazardous conjecture, involving the entire change of a phrase, or producing a sense which the author never contemplated. In the present instance the nominative has been restored, not only because the construction obviously requires it, but because it is fully confirmed by Athenag. Legat. c. 2, οὐδὲν δὲ ὄνομα ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ οὐ πονηρὸν οὔτε χρηστὸν νομίζεται· διὰ δὲ τὰς ὑποκειμένας αὐτοῖς ἢ πονηρὰς ἢ ἀγαθὰς πράξεις, ἢ φλαῦρα ἢ ἀγαθὰ δοκεῖ (*scil.* τὰ ὀνόματα). It appears from the frequent complaints of the Fathers, that a blind and infuriate hatred was directed against the very *names* of *Christ* and *Christian*. See the citation from Tertullian immediately below.

3. ὅσον γε. *Subaud.* κρίνειν ἐστί. *So far at least as one may judge.* Vulgo, ὅσον τε. The difference between Τ and Γ is so trifling, that there can be no hesitation in correcting an error, which is sufficiently indicated by the recurrence of the proper form, and in a construction precisely similar, in this same chapter.

4. χρηστότατοι ὑπάρχομεν. In thus playing upon the words Χριστὸς and χρηστὸς, Justin takes advantage of the manner in which they were very generally confused by the heathen; partly in consequence of a habit, which the Benedict editor has shewn to have prevailed at the time, of giving to *I* the sound of *E*; and partly from the frequent use of the names *Chrestus* and *Chresta* among the Romans, as proved from existing inscriptions. A well-known instance of this confusion is that in Sueton. Claud. c. 25, *Judæos, impulsore* Chresto *assiduè tumultuantes, Roma expulit.* Tertullian thus speaks of the error, and argues upon it, like Justin, with reference to the odium attached to the name itself, in Apol. c. 3: *Nunc igitur, si nominis odium est, quis nominum reatus? Quæ accusatio vocabulorum, nisi si aut barbarum sonat aliqua vox nominis, aut infaustum, aut maledicum, aut impudicum?* Christianus *vero, quantum interpretatio est, de* Unctione *deducitur. Sed et cum perperam* Chrestianus *pronuntiatur a vobis,—nam nec nominis certa est notitia penes vos—de* suavitate *vel* benignitate *compositum est.* Oditur *ergo in hominibus innocuis etiam* nomen innocuum. *At enim* secta oditur in nomine *utique sui auctoris.* Hence also Lactant. Inst. Div. IV. 7, *Exponenda hujus nominis ratio est, propter ignorantium errorem, qui eum, immutata litera,* Chrestum *solent dicere.* [An legendum, *ignorantiam eorum*?] With respect to the play upon the words, Justin calls the heathen ἀχρήστοι, and enemies of Christ, in c. 46, ὥστε καὶ οἱ προγενόμενοι ἄνευ λόγου βιώσαντες ἄχρηστοι καὶ ἐχθροὶ τῷ Χριστῷ ἦσαν. Neither is he singular in this fancy; for, on the other hand, Theophilus says (ad Autol. I. 1, 12), ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν ὁμολογῶ εἶναι Χριστιανός, καὶ φορῶ

τὴν πολιτείαν εὑρισκόμεθα ἀδικοῦντες, ὑμέτερον ἀγωνιᾶσαί ἐστι, μὴ ἀδίκως κολάζοντες τοὺς μὴ ἐλεγχομένους τῇ δίκῃ κόλασιν ὀφλήσητε. Ἐξ ὀνόματος μὲν γὰρ ἢ ἔπαινος ἢ κόλασις οὐκ ἂν εὐλόγως γένοιτο, ἢν μή τι ἐνάρετον ἢ φαῦλον δὶ ἔργων ἀποδείκνυσθαι δύνηται· καὶ γὰρ τοὺς κατηγορουμένους ἐφ' ὑμῶν πάντας πρὶν ἐλεγχθῆναι οὐ τιμωρεῖτε, ἐφ' ἡμῶν δὲ τὸ ὄνομα ὡς ἔλεγχον λαμβάνετε, καίπερ, ὅσον γε ἐκ τοῦ ὀνόματος, τοὺς κατηγοροῦντας μᾶλλον κολάζειν ὀφείλετε. Χριστιανοὶ γὰρ εἶναι κατηγορούμεθα· τὸ δὲ χρηστὸν μισεῖσθαι οὐ δίκαιον. Καὶ πάλιν, ἐὰν μέν τις τῶν κατηγορουμένων ἔξαρνος γένηται, τῇ φωνῇ μὴ εἶναι φήσας, ἀφίετε αὐτὸν, ὡς μηδὲν ἐλέγχειν ἔχοντες ἁμαρτανοντα, ἐὰν δέ τις ὁμολογήσῃ εἶναι, διὰ τὴν ὁμολογίαν κολάζετε· δέον καὶ τὸν

τὸ θεοφιλὲς ὄνομα τοῦτο, ἐλπίζων εὔχρηστος εἶναι τὸ Θεῷ. Comp. p. 77, B. Clem. Alex. Strom. II. That similar *paranomasiæ* were much in vogue both with sacred and profane writers, see Grotius on Matth. i. 21. Where the allusion is repeated a few lines onward, Grabe and others would read Χρηστιανοί, as if it were necessary that Justin should suit his *etymology* to the erroneous pronunciation of the heathen. There is something sublimely ridiculous in the grave affirmation of Brauniius, that he was not ignorant of the true derivation of the name of *Christ;* in proof whereof he adduces Apol. I. 12; II. 6.

7. *πολιτείαν. Our conduct as citizens.*

11. *τοὺς κατηγ. ἐφ' ὑμῶν πάντας.* Thalemann would read *ἐξ ὑμῶν*, and, it should seem, rightly. In all probability, the received text arose out of the corresponding form *ἐφ' ἡμῶν* in the following clause; but the sense is different. Here it is, *all* among, or, *out of yourselves, who are accused of any crime;* there, *but* in our case, or, against us, *you receive the name as evidence.* In the editions of Morell, *πάντων* is a misprint. With respect to Justin's complaint, it is urged also by Athenagoras in Legat. c. 2, *οἱ παρ' ὑμῖν κρινόμενοι, κἂν ἐπὶ μεγίστοις φεύγωσι, θαῤῥοῦσιν, εἰδότες ὅτι ἐξετάσετε αὐτῶν τὸν βίον, καὶ οὔτε τοῖς ὀνόμασι προσθήσεσθε, κ. τ. λ.*

16. *ἐὰν μέν τις τῶν κατηγορουμένων κ. τ. λ.* This also was an instance of the perversion of the ordinary rules of justice, very commonly alleged against their persecutors by the early Christians; who were not tortured, according to the usual process of judicial inquiry, to make them confess a crime, but to make them deny the charge which they had willingly admitted. Tertull. Apol. c. 2: *Itaque nec in illo ex forma malorum judicandorum agitis erga nos, quod cæteris negantibus adhibetis tormenta ad confitendum, solis Christianis ad negandum....Cum præsumatis de sceleribus nostris ex nominis confessione, cogitis tormentis de confessione decedere. ....Vociferatur homo,* Christianus sum: *quod est, dicit; tu vis audire quod non est. Veritatis extorquendæ præsides, de nobis solis mendacium elaboratis audire.* Compare ibid. c. 7, ad Nat. I. 1, ad Scap. c. 4.; Epist. Mart. Lugd. ap. Euseb. H. E. v. 1; Origen. c. Cels. II.; Lactant. Inst. Div. v. 11.

18. *τις.* Ed. Steph. *τι.* A typographical error.

τοῦ ὁμολογοῦντος βίον εὐθύνειν, καὶ τὸν τοῦ ἀρνουμένου, ὅπως διὰ τῶν πράξεων ὁποῖός ἐστιν ἕκαστος φαίνηται. Ὃν γὰρ τρόπον παραλαβόντες τινὲς παρὰ τοῦ διδασκάλου Χριστοῦ μὴ ἀρνεῖσθαι ἐξεταζόμενοι παρακελεύονται, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον κακῶς ζῶντες ἴσως ἀφορμὰς παρέχουσι τοῖς ἄλλως καταλέγειν τῶν πάντων Χριστιανῶν ἀσέβειαν καὶ ἀδικίαν αἱρουμένοις. Οὐκ ὀρθῶς μὲν οὐδὲ τοῦτο πράττεται. Καὶ γάρ τοι φιλοσοφίας ὄνομα καὶ σχῆμα ἐπιγράφονταί τινες, οἳ οὐδὲν ἄξιον τῆς ὑποσχέσεως πράττουσι· γινώσκετε δ' ὅτι καὶ οἱ τὰ ἐναντία δοξάσαντες καὶ δογματίσαντες τῶν παλαιῶν τῷ ἑνὶ ὀνόματι προσαγορεύονται φιλόσοφοι. Καὶ τούτων τινὲς ἀθεότητα ἐδίδαξαν, καὶ τὸν Δία ἀσελγῆ ἅμα τοῖς αὐτοῦ παισὶν οἱ γενόμενοι ποιηταὶ καταγγέλλουσι· κἀκείνων τὰ διδάγματα οἱ μετερχόμενοι οὐκ εἴργονται πρὸς ὑμῶν, ἆθλα δὲ καὶ τιμὰς τοῖς εὐφώνως ὑβρίζουσι τούτους τίθετε.

23. μὴ ἀρνεῖσθαι. Scil. αὐτόν. See Matth. x. 33. Or the verb may be used *absolutely* with reference to a precept so well known, just as παρακελεύονται, in this same sentence, has no adjunct, inasmuch as the nature and mode of the *exhortation* or *consolation* offered—both senses may perhaps be included—were sufficiently understood. The best commentary on the passage will be found in the concluding sentences of Tertullian's Apology.

24. ἄλλως. This is the reading of the MSS. and earlier editions, and unquestionably correct. Grabe and others, however, read τοῖς ἄλλοις, probably from misunderstanding the import of ἄλλως, which it bears in a variety of passages of the best writers. It properly means *otherwise;* then *in another way that is just or proper;* and consequently *without cause, rashly*. See Ruhnken. ad Timæi Lex. Plat. under οὐκ ἄλλως. Hermann. ad Lucian. de Hist. Conscr. p. 70. Translate therefore τοῖς ἄλλως αἱρουμένοις, *to those who, without consideration, take upon themselves to, &c.* Misled by τοῖς ἄλλοις, which as it stands is scarcely Greek, Thirlby proposed, as an emendation, καταλέγειν τ. π. Χ. ὡς ἀσ. καὶ ἀδ. αἱρουμένων.

26. καὶ γάρ τοι φιλοσοφίας ὄνομα κ. τ. λ. Justin has a similar argument respecting real and professing Christians, contrasted with the different sects of Judaism, as here with the various schools of philosophy, in Dial. Tryph. c. 20. Origen also frequently employs the same reasoning in his work against Celsus: for example, in book 2, ὥσπερ οὐ Φιλοσοφίας ἔγκλημά ἐστι σοφισταί, ἢ οἵτινες ποτ' ἂν ὦσιν οἱ ψευδοδοξοῦντες· οὕτως οὐ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Χριστιανισμοῦ ἔγκλημα, οἱ μεταχαράττοντες τὰ Εὐαγγέλια, καὶ αἱρέσεις ξένας ἐπεισάγοντες τῷ βουλήματι τῆς Ἰησοῦ διδασκαλίας.

31. τὸν Δία ἀσελγῆ κ. τ. λ. See also Orat. ad Græc. c. 2; Tatian Orat. c. Gr. p. 33; Clement. Alex. Admonit. ad Gent. p. 11.

34. ὑβρίζουσι τούτους. *Insult them;* namely, by exhibiting their *disgraceful pictures* in their dramatic writings and representations. The earlier editions have τούτοις, but the accusative has been properly restored by the Benedictine and

Attributing the persecutions to which Christians were exposed to the instigation of dæmons;

V. Τί δὴ οὖν τοῦτ' ἂν εἴη; ἐφ' ἡμῶν ὑπισχνουμένων μηδὲν ἀδικεῖν, μηδὲ τὰ ἄθεα ταῦτα δοξάζειν, οὐ κρίσεις ἐξετάζετε, ἀλλά, ἀλόγῳ πάθει καὶ μάστιγι δαιμόνων φαύλων ἐξελαυνόμενοι, ἀκρίτως κολάζετε μὴ φροντίζοντες. Εἰρήσεται γὰρ τἀληθές· ἐπεὶ τὸ παλαιὸν δαίμονες φαῦλοι, ἐπιφανείας ποιησάμενοι, καὶ γυναῖκας ἐμοίχευσαν, καὶ παῖδας διέφθειραν, καὶ φόβητρα ἀνθρώποις ἔδειξαν, ὡς καταπλαγῆναι αὐτοὺς οἳ λόγῳ τὰς γινομένας πράξεις οὐκ ἔκρινον, ἀλλὰ δέει συνηρπασμένοι, καὶ μὴ ἐπιστάμενοι δαίμονας εἶναι φαύλους, θεοὺς προσωνόμαζον, καὶ ὀνόματι ἕκαστον προσηγόρευον, ὅπερ ἕκαστος αὐτῷ τῶν δαιμόνων ἐτίθετο. Ὅτε δὲ Σωκράτης

other editors, from the MSS. Theophilus uses the same expression, borrowed evidently from Justin, in his work *ad Autol.* III. 30, τοὺς σεβομένους αὐτὸν ἐδίωξαν καὶ τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν διώκουσιν; οὐ μὴν· ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς εὐφώνως ὑβρίζουσι τὸν θεὸν ἆθλα καὶ τιμὰς τιθέασι. Tertullian has a long chapter (Apol. c. 15.) on the disgusting indecencies of the stage, the applause which they elicited, and the rewards conferred on the actors; nor do the other apologists withhold their indignant remonstrances on the subject. Cf. Arnob. c. gent. IV. 35; Minuc. F. Oct. c. 37; Lactant. Inst. Div. v. 20. See also Tertull. ad Nat. I. 10.

V. 1. τί δὴ οὖν τοῦτ' ἂν εἴη; There can be no doubt that Braunius is right in restoring the Benedictine punctuation. Others point either at ἡμῶν or δοξάζειν. The words to be connected are, ἐφ' ἡμῶν οὐ κρίσεις ἐξετάζετε: and the syntax is precisely the same as that of c. 4, ἐφ' ἡμῶν τὸ ὄνομα ὡς ἔλεγχον λαμβάνετε. *Grabe* would read κρίσει, as in c. 3, οὐ κρίσει, ἀλλὰ πάθει. Though possibly correct, the emendation is not so palpable as to warrant a change in the text; and οὓς οὐ κρίσει, the conjecture of Pearson, plainly arose out of the false punctuation of the early editions.

3. μάστιγι δ. φ. ἐξελαυνόμενοι. Justin repeatedly ascribes persecution, whether exercised against Christians, or against those heathens who lived virtuously and agreeably to the light vouchsafed to them, to the malice of dæmons. Compare Apol. I. cc. 12, 44; II. cc. 1, 7, 8, 12; Dial. Tryph. c. 39. So likewise Tertull. Apol. c. 27; *De fuga in Persec.* c. 1; Lactant. Inst. Div. v. 21, 23.

5. ἐπιφανείας ποιησάμενοι. *Effecting apparitions of themselves:* either visibly or in dreams. Supra, c. 14, καὶ ποτὲ μὲν δι' ὀνείρων ἐπιφανείας, ποτὲ δ' αὖ διὰ μαγικῶν στροφῶν κ. τ. λ. Of Justin's opinions respecting *angels* and *dæmons*, see Bishop Kaye's work, pp. 105, sqq.

7. αὐτοὺς οἳ λόγῳ κ. τ. λ. Vulgo τούς. Pearson's correction seems to be almost indispensable.

11. ἕκαστος αὐτῷ ἐτίθετο. Apol. II. c. 5, ὀνόματι γὰρ ἕκαστον, ὅπερ ἕκαστος ἑαυτῷ τῶν ἀγγέλων καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ἔθετο, προσηγόρευσαν. Hence it has been proposed here also to read αὑτῷ for αὐτῷ. It frequently happens, however, that the *personal* pronoun is found in the sense of the *reflexive;* though, in most cases, the MSS. very commonly exhibit a variation of breathing. See Matth. Gr. Gram. §. 148, Obs. 3. At the same time, there is sufficient uncertainty, especially in the later writers, to render it inexpedient to alter the text. Comp. Diod. Sic. XVII. 64;

λόγῳ ἀληθεῖ καὶ ἐξεταστικῶς ταῦτα εἰς φανερὸν ἐπειρᾶτο φέρειν, καὶ ἀπάγειν τῶν δαιμόνων τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ αὐτοὶ οἱ δαίμονες διὰ τῶν χαιρόντων τῇ κακίᾳ ἀνθρώπων ἐνήργησαν ὡς ἄθεον καὶ ἀσεβῆ ἀποκτεῖναι, λέγοντες, Καινὰ εἰσφέρειν αὐτὸν δαιμόνια· καὶ ὁμοίως ἐφ' ἡμῶν τὸ αὐτὸ ἐνεργοῦσιν. Οὐ γὰρ μόνον ἐν Ἕλλησι διὰ Σωκράτους ὑπὸ λόγου ἠλέγχθη ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν βαρβάροις ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ λόγου μορφωθέντος, καὶ ἀνθρώπου γενομένου, καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

Arrian. Epict. I. 19; Herodian. I. 17, 9, II. 4, 13, IV. 11, 13; Matt. iii. 16, xxi. 45; John i. 48, iv. 47, xiii. 11; Eph. i. 9; Heb. xi. 21.

12. ἐξεταστικῶς. *Arceriis mavult* ἐξεταστικῷ. SYLBURG. Conjectures of this kind, in regard to a style like Justin's, are altogether nugatory.—ταῦτα. The absurd notions of the heathen respecting their gods.

15. ἐνήργησαν ἀποκτεῖναι. *Were active to kill him.* See Bp. Middleton on the Gr. Article, in his note on Matth. xiv. 2. Thirlby would read αὐτὸν for αὐτοί, in the beginning of the clause; but the grammatical construction, more especially after καὶ signifying *even*, confirms the received text.

15. λέγοντες, Καινὰ εἰσφ. αὐτὸν δαιμόνια. Xen. Mem. I. 1, 1, ἡ μὲν γὰρ γραφὴ κατ' αὐτοῦ τοιάδε τις ἦν· ἀδικεῖ Σωκράτης οὓς μὲν ἡ πόλις νομίζει θεοὺς οὐ νομίζων, ἕτερα δὲ καινὰ δαιμόνια εἰσφέρων. See also Plat. Apol. Socr. vol. I. p. 56, ed. Bipont. Justin has a passage of precisely the same import in Apol. II. c. 10. Socrates is also made to bear testimony against heathenism in Tertull. Apol. c. 14; Lactant. Inst. Div. v. 15.

17. ἐν Ἕλλησι. The insertion of the preposition, which is wanting in the copies, is fully warranted not only by the laws of construction, but by the corresponding form ἐν βαρβάροις in the following clause. Compare also c. 7, *init.*—It may be observed, that here and elsewhere Justin employs the term βάρβαροι in accordance with the prejudices of those whom he was addressing. Thus again he calls Abraham and other Hebrew worthies *barbarians* in c. 45 infra. The same mode of designation prevails also in Clemens Alexandrinus, Epiphanius, and other Fathers.

18. ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ λόγου. The word λόγος is used by Justin in *three* distinct senses, to denote either *speech* or the *word spoken*; *human reason*; or the *Incarnate Word*. Hence it is sometimes difficult, even when in some degree guided by the insertion or omission of the article, to determine the sense in which it is to be understood. Here there seems at first sight to be a distinction between λόγος and ὁ Λόγος, *reason* and the *Divine Word*, or second Person in the Trinity; but, by a comparison of other passages, it appears that whatever right opinions the Gentile philosophers had been enabled to form on the nature of God and goodness, are ascribed by this writer to the influence, though imparted in less ample measure, of the seed of the Word sown in their hearts. Apol. II. c. 13, διὰ τῆς ἐνούσης ἐμφύτου τοῦ λόγου σπορᾶς ἀμυδρῶς ἐδύναντο ὁρᾷν τὰ ὄντα. Compare also Apol. I. c. 44. Of the opinions of Justin respecting the Λόγος and the Trinity, see Bp. Kaye's work, c. 2, p. 46, sqq. The import of the verb μορφεῖσθαι may be explained by the synonym σαρκοποιεῖσθαι, which is found in cc. 32, 66. Compare Phil. II. 6, 7. In Dial. Tryph. c. 70, we have σωματοποιεῖσθαι.

κληθέντος, ᾧ πεισθέντες ἡμεῖς τοὺς ταῦτα πράξαντας δαίμονας οὐ μόνον μὴ θεοὺς εἶναι φαμεν, ἀλλὰ κακοὺς καὶ ἀνοσίους δαίμονας, οἳ οὐδὲ τοῖς ἀρετὴν ποθοῦσιν ἀνθρώποις τὰς πράξεις ὁμοίας ἔχουσιν.

VI. Ἐνθένδε καὶ ἄθεοι κεκλήμεθα. Καὶ ὁμολογοῦμεν τῶν τοιούτων νομιζομένων θεῶν ἄθεοι εἶναι, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τοῦ ἀληθεστάτου, καὶ πατρὸς δικαιοσύνης καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετῶν, ἀνεπιμίκτου τε κακίας Θεοῦ. Ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνόν τε, καὶ τὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ υἱὸν ἐλθόντα, καὶ διδάξαντα ἡμᾶς

And admitting the charge of Atheism, so far as a belief in the deity of the dæmons was concerned; Justin repels the charge, in the first place, by asserting the Christian worship of the TRINITY.

21. *μὴ θεοὺς εἶναί φαμεν.* There is little doubt that ὀρθοὺς, the vulgar reading, is erroneous: and as the belief of Justin is evidently opposed to that of the heathen, the correction, if it is to be elicited at all, must be derived from this difference of belief. In the beginning of this chapter it is said that the latter called their dæmons θεοὺς; whence Davies, and after him Thirlby and Braunius, adopt the very probable and natural emendation of θεοὺς for ὀρθοὺς. Otto, on the other hand, maintains, with the Benedictine editor Maranus, that although Justin *might*, there is no reason why he *should*, have written θεοὺς; and contends that ὀρθοὺς is properly opposed to κακούς. It is clear, however, that in such an antithesis, ἀγαθοὺς would have been the adjective employed; and its substitution for ὀρθοὺς, which is an unheard-of epithet of δαίμονας, would have been an easy emendation, were it not for the obvious consideration above suggested. Under such circumstances, it has been thought advisable to receive θεοὺς into the text.

VI. 1. *ἄθεοι κεκλήμεθα.* This seems to have been the principal accusation alleged against the primitive Christians. Dio Cassius (Hist. R. LXVII. 14.) speaks of it as a common charge, in the time of Domitian, against those who embraced the Jewish religion; evidently confounding Judaism with Christianity : and he attributes the martyrdom of *Acilius Glabrio* to this cause. The term was more frequently employed by the multitude, who looked upon the absence of temples and altars, and the outward symbols of religion, in the light of *absolute atheism;* but the educated classes, who were perfectly aware that the Christians were not without an object of worship, applied it in a modified sense with reference to their rejection of the national deities. Justin repels the charge in both forms; and a full refutation of it will be found in the passage of Arnobius, quoted in the *Introduction* (p. 4); in Athenagoras (Legat. c. 4), Clemens Alex. (Strom. VII. 1, 4), and Tertullian (Apol. c. 10).

5. *καὶ διδάξαντα ἡμᾶς ταῦτα κ. τ. λ.* The import of this passage has long been a *vexata quæstio* between divines of the Romish and Protestant Churches. It must be conceded that, according to the strict grammatical construction, the *worship of angels* is distinctly set forth ; but, in a writer so careless and inaccurate as Justin, a sentence even far less observant of the laws of syntax could not be allowed for a moment to set aside the express and incontrovertible testimony which this very Apology affords, and that within a few short pages, to the primitive worship of the three Persons in the ever-blessed Trinity, as the only legitimate objects of Christian adoration. Thus he says in c. 13: *ἄθεοι μὲν οὖν ὡς οὔκ ἐσμεν, τὸν δημιουργὸν τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς σεβόμενοι, τίς σωφρονῶν οὐκ ὁμολογήσει; τὸν*

6 *ταῦτα καὶ τὸν τῶν ἄλλων ἑπομένων καὶ ἐξομοιουμένων ἀγαθῶν ἀγγέλων στρατὸν, πνεῦμά τε τὸ προφητικὸν σεβόμεθα*

διδάσκαλόν τε τούτων γενόμενον ἡμῖν καὶ εἰς τοῦτο γεννηθέντα, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὄντως Θεοῦ μαθόντες καὶ ἐν δευτέρᾳ χώρᾳ ἔχοντες, πνεῦμά τε προφητικὸν ἐν τριτῇ τάξει ὅτι μετὰ λόγου τιμῶμεν, ἀποδείξομεν. See also cc. 60, 61, 67. Again, *ὡς δὲ καὶ τὸν Θεὸν μόνον δεῖ προσκυνεῖν* (c. 16), he proves by citing Matt. iv. 10, xix. 16. It is clear therefore that Justin could never have intended in this passage to have inculcated the adoration of angels; nor if he had simply meant, as some contend, that a worship inferior to that of the Trinity was paid to them, would he have placed the angelic host in immediate relation with the second, and *before* the third Person in the Godhead. He *might* indeed have said, though he *does not*, that the angels were regarded with due respect and reverence, as stated by Athenagoras (Legat. c. 10) and other writers: and Ashton proposes a transposition of the clauses, which would give this meaning, in the following order: *διδαξάντα ἡμᾶς ταῦτα, πνεῦμά τε τὸ πρ. σεβόμεθα καὶ προσκυνοῦμεν λόγῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ, τιμῶντες καὶ τὸν τῶν ἄλλων κ. τ. λ.* Without supposing any such dislocation, however, there are two methods of clearing Justin from the imputation of angel-worship; either of which will not only satisfactorily answer the purpose, but have even been adopted, one or other of them, by certain critics of the Romanist creed. Cave, Grabe, Basnage, Thalemann, and others, connect *τὸν ἀγγέλων στρατὸν* with *ἡμᾶς*, to the effect that Christ *taught the angels* as well as *men*: and they adduce, in support of this opinion, Ephes. iii. 10, *ἵνα γνωρισθῇ νῦν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ.* Thus Iren. Hær. II. 55: *Semper co-existens Filius Patri olim et ab initio, semper revelat Patrem et angelis et archangelis et potestatibus et virtutibus, et omnibus quibus vult revelare* [revelari?] *Deus.* Perhaps in this case, the order of the words would rather have been *καὶ ταῦτα διδάξαντα ἡμᾶς καὶ τὸν τῶν ἄλλων κ. τ. λ.*; whence, and whence only, the exposition of Scultetus, Bull, and the Benedictine Le Nourry, is probably to be preferred. These join *ταῦτα καὶ τὸν ἀγγέλων στρατὸν*, and render the passage thus: *Him we worship and adore, and his Son* (*who came from him*, and *who has taught us these things* respecting the dæmons, *and also the existence of a host of good angels who follow him and are like unto him*), *and the prophetic spirit, reverencing them in reason and in truth.* The parenthesis, though certainly harsh and unnatural, was evidently introduced in order to set the delusion of the *dæmons* in opposition with the office of *good angels*, who follow the instructions of Christ, and thus resemble him in nature; an opposition indicated by the insertion of *ἄλλων*, unless indeed that adjective is redundant, as, among many similar instances, in Hom. Od. B. 412, *μήτηρ δὲ μοὶ οὔτι πέπυσται, Οὔτ' ἄλλαι δμωαί.* Plat. Gorg. 64, *εὐδαιμονιζόμενος ὑπὸ τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ξένων.* See Heindorf. ad loc. and Ast ad Phædr. p. 241. For the sense in which *ἕπεσθαι* is used, see Apol. I. cc. 2, 8, 26, 38. Cohort. ad Gr. c. 22. Dial. Tryph. cc. 1, 134. That Christ did inform mankind of the existence and the office of angels, see Matt. xiii. 39, 41, xviii. 10; Luke xvi. 22, xx. 36. As to the objection that *διδάσκειν τινα τινα* is not Greek, it is clear, from the import of the expression as here employed, that it amounts in *fact*, though not in *form*, to *διδάσκειν τινα τι*, and is in some sort, though not altogether, analogous to such forms as *διδάσκειν τινα ποιήτην, αὐλήτην*, and the like. It is scarcely worth while to mention the conjectural

καὶ προσκυνοῦμεν, λόγῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ τιμῶντες, καὶ παντὶ βουλομένῳ μαθεῖν, ὡς ἐδιδάχθημεν, ἀφθόνως παραδιδόντες.

VII. Ἀλλά, φήσει τις, ἤδη τινὲς ληφθέντες ἠλέγχθησαν κακοῦργοι. Καὶ γὰρ πολλοὺς πολλάκις, ὅταν ἑκάστοτε τῶν κατηγορουμένων τὸν βίον ἐξετάζητε, ἀλλ' οὐ διὰ τοὺς προλεχθέντας, καταδικάζετε. Καθόλου μὲν οὖν κἀκεῖνο ὁμολογοῦμεν, ὅτι ὃν τρόπον οἱ ἐν Ἕλλησι τὰ αὐτοῖς ἀρεστὰ δογματίσαντες ἐκ παντὸς τῷ ἑνὶ ὀνόματι φιλοσοφίας προσαγορεύονται, καίπερ τῶν δογμάτων ἐναντίων ὄντων, οὕτως καὶ τῶν ἐν βαρβάροις γενομένων καὶ δοξάντων σοφῶν τὸ ἐπικατηγορούμενον ὄνομα κοινόν ἐστι. Χριστιανοὶ γὰρ πάντες

He acknowledges that, as in all sects and communities, all are not equally worthy, so doubtless some professing Christians had been deservedly punished for their crimes; but denounces the injustice of punishing the innocent without inquiry into their mode of life, simply because they are believers in Christ:

reading, στρατηγὸν for στρατὸν, suggested by the passages in the Dialogue with Trypho (cc. 36, 61, 62), where Christ is said to have called himself *the Leader of the heavenly host.* This, as Bp. Kaye remarks, is to construct for Justin a sentence which, careless as he is, he could never have written. The learned Prelate's own notion—with the greatest deference to so high authority be it spoken—that καὶ τὸν ἀγγ. στρατὸν is equivalent to μετὰ τοῦ αγγ. στρατοῦ, so as to indicate the glorified state of Christ as he will be surrounded by the heavenly host at his *second coming to judgment*, seems to be altogether out of keeping with the context, which bears upon his *first coming to teach.* For the rest it is possible, considering the general looseness of Justin's quotations from Scripture, that the clause λόγῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ τιμῶντες is built upon John iv. 24.

9. ὡς ἐδιδάχθημεν. *Erunt fortasse qui omnino legendum putent* ὅσα. *Nos nihil mutamus.* THIRLBY.

VII. 3. διὰ τοὺς προλεχθέντας. *Scil.* δαίμονας. *It is true that some Christians may have been convicted as evil doers: for you condemn many after enquiring into the charges brought against them, as notorious offenders, and not at the instigation of the* dæmons *before mentioned: nor is it to be supposed that all the professors of Christianity, any more than all the followers of the several philosophising sects, are alike worthy of their vocation.* None of the Commentators have understood the passage; and the result has been conjecture without end, each leaving the matter as perplexed as before. Some read διὰ τοὺς προελεγχθέντας, that is, *you condemn criminals, but not because others have been convicted beforehand.* Surely this is utterly unintelligible, and equally so the change of πολλοὺς into πολλοί, with or without the insertion of πάντας before καταδικάζετε. Grabe would read διὰ τοῦτο προλεχθέντας, understanding ἐλέγχετε after πολλάκις. Otto defends the common text, rendering διὰ τοὺς προλεχθέντας, *ob illos de quibus antea locutus sum; i.e.* the sincere Christians, who are not the cause of condemnation to the bad. Too far fetched to be the correct interpretation, still this does not fall much short of the correct one; for, though διὰ τὰ προλεχθέντα would perhaps have been more readily understood, there is no reason to question the genuine text, of which the explanation given above is perfectly in keeping with the writer's argument.

8. τὸ ἐπικατηγορούμενον ὄνομα. *The name upon which accusations are accumulated.* Compare Acts xxviii. 22.

προσαγορεύονται. Ὅθεν πάντων τῶν καταγγελλομένων ὑμῖν τὰς πράξεις κρίνεσθαι ἀξιοῦμεν, ἵνα ὁ ἐλεγχθεὶς ὡς ἄδικος κολάζηται, ἀλλὰ μὴ ὡς Χριστιανός· ἐὰν δέ τις ἀνέλεγκτος φάνηται, ἀπολύηται, ὡς Χριστιανὸς οὐδὲν ἀδικῶν. Οὐ γὰρ τοὺς κατηγοροῦντας κολάζειν ὑμᾶς ἀξιώσομεν· ἀρκοῦνται γὰρ τῇ προσούσῃ πονηρίᾳ καὶ τῇ τῶν καλῶν ἀγνοίᾳ.

while their innocence is rendered more conspicuous by the fact, that they would rather die than live by falsehood; and their error, if it be one, can injure no one but themselves.

VIII. Λογίσασθε δ' ὅτι ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ταῦτα ἔφημεν, ἐκ τοῦ ἐφ' ἡμῖν εἶναι ἀρνεῖσθαι ἐξεταζομένους· ἀλλ' οὐ βουλόμεθα ζῆν ψευδολογοῦντες. Τοῦ γὰρ αἰωνίου καὶ καθαροῦ βίου ἐπιθυμοῦντες τῆς μετὰ Θεοῦ, τοῦ πάντων πατρὸς καὶ δημιουργοῦ, διαγωγῆς ἀντιποιούμεθα, καὶ σπεύδομεν ἐπὶ τὸ ὁμολογεῖν οἱ πεπεισμένοι καὶ πιστεύοντες τυχεῖν τούτων δύνασθαι τοὺς τὸν Θεὸν δι' ἔργων πείσαντας, ὅτι αὐτῷ εἵποντο, καὶ τῆς παρ' αὐτῷ διαγωγῆς ἤρων, ἔνθα κακία οὐκ ἀντιτυπεῖ. Ὡς μὲν οὖν διὰ βραχέων εἰπεῖν, ἅ τε προσδοκῶμεν, καὶ μεμαθήκαμεν διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ διδάσκομεν, ταῦτά

11. *ὁ ἐλεγχθεὶς ὡς ἄδικος κ. τ. λ.* 1 Pet. iv. 15. *μὴ γάρ τις ὑμῶν πασχέτω ὡς φονεὺς, ἢ κλέπτης, ἢ κακοποιὸς, ἢ ὡς ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος· εἰ δὲ ὡς Χριστιανὸς, μὴ αἰσχυνέσθω.*

13. *φάνηται.* Vulgo *φανῆται. οὐ γὰρ τοὺς κατηγοροῦντας κ. τ. λ.* In the *Rescript of Adrian*, annexed to this Apology, the Emperor directs that any who brought false accusations against the Christians, should be punished. Probably Justin alludes to this circumstance. He refers to this rescript expressly at the conclusion of the Apology.

VIII. 3. *καθαροῦ.* It has been proposed to read *μακαρίου*, on the plea that, wherever Justin speaks of a future state, he says nothing *περὶ τῆς καθαρότητος.* And yet he speaks only a few lines onward of the *διαγωρὴ παρὰ Θεῷ*, the *intercourse with God, ἔνθα κακία οὐκ ἀντιτυπεῖ, where no evil will assail.* It is possible, however, that *κακία* in this place denotes *sorrow*, in which sense it occurs in Eccles. xii. 1, 2; Matt. vi. 34. Thus Chrysostom explains it by *ταλαιπωρία.* It is also opposed to *ἡδονὴ* in Thucyd. III. 50. Still, in any case, there is no need whatever of the alteration suggested.

6. *οἱ πεπεισμένοι καὶ πιστεύοντες. We who are persuaded and believe.* This emphatic repetition is frequent in Justin. See Apol. I. cc. 10, 17, 18, 61.

8. *ἤρων.* Imperf. 3rd sing. of *ἐράω, to love.*

10. *ταῦτά.* The *expectation* of a future life, and the *means* of obtaining it. Bp. Pearson seems to think that Justin here inserted the Christian's *Creed*, or *confession of faith;* but though it is possible, and even probable, that the articles of faith, as contained perhaps in the *Apostles' Creed*, were from the first taught to converts and children by word of mouth, no evidence exists that the early Christians used any written creed. The earliest creeds now extant are those of *Irenæus* (Hær. I. 10, 1), and *Tertullian* (de Præscript. Hær. c. 13). There are two other *Regulæ Fidei* in the writings of Tertullian (*contra Prax.* c. 2, *De Virg. Veland.* c. 1); but they were manifestly compiled after his fall into *Montanism.*

ἐστι· Πλάτων δὲ ὁμοίως ἔφη Ῥαδάμανθυν καὶ Μίνω κολάσειν τοὺς ἀδίκους παρ' αὐτοὺς ἐλθόντας· ἡμεῖς δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ πρᾶγμά φαμεν γενήσεσθαι, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς σώμασι μετὰ τῶν ψυχῶν γινομένων καὶ αἰωνίαν κόλασιν κολασθησομένων, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ χιλιονταετῆ περίοδον, ὡς ἐκεῖνος ἔφη, μόνον. Εἰ μὲν οὖν ἄπιστον ἢ ἀδύνατον τοῦτο φήσει τις, πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἥδε ἡ πλάνη ἐστὶν, ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς ἕτερον, μέχρις οὗ ἔργῳ μηδὲν ἀδικοῦντες ἐλεγχόμεθα.

11. Ῥαδάμανθυν. This is the reading of the MSS. Thalemann gives Ῥαδάμανθον, which is incorrect. Compare Tatian. c. Græc. c. 6; Athenag. Legat. c. 12. The reference to Plato is in the Gorgias (vol. IV. p. 155 sq. ed. Bipont.). Compare Cohort. ad Græc. cc. 1, 14.

13. ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. So in c. 53, αὐτὸς τὴν κρίσιν τοῦ παντὸς ἀνθρωπίνου γένους ποιήσεται. καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς σώμασι κ. τ. λ. This passage is manifestly corrupt, and the emendations which have been proposed, are not very satisfactory. *Thirlby* would read γινομένοις and κολασθησομένοις. Rather perhaps ἐγειρομένοις. The Benedictine editor supplies αὐτῶν or ἀνθρώπων with γινομένων, or rather γενομένων. Compare c. 52. Might not the comma be removed after Χριστοῦ, and the sense be continued unbroken by reading ἐπὶ τοῖς αὐτῶν (*scil.* τῶν ἀδίκων) σώμασι κ. τ. λ. The meaning at all events is obvious. Justin clearly asserts the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, and the eternity of future punishments. This latter doctrine he also unequivocally asserts in Apol. I. cc. 12, 17, 45, 52, II. 1, 2, 7; Dial. Tryph. c. 117, and elsewhere. It is true that the following passage occurs in the Dial. Tryph. c. 5, οὕτως αἱ μὲν ψυχαὶ, ἄξιαι τοῦ θεοῦ φανεῖσαι, οὐκ ἀποθνήσκουσιν ἔτι· αἱ δὲ κολάζονται ἔς τ' ἂν αὐτὰς καὶ εἶναι καὶ κολάζεσθαι ὁ Θεὸς θέλῃ. Now, as Justin's instructor—for these are not the words of Justin himself—had just before said that the souls of the wicked did not die, ἕρμαιον γὰρ ἦν ὡς ἀληθῶς τοῖς κακοῖς, he can therefore only mean to assert the *possibility, should God please,* not the *reality,* of the annihilation of the souls of the wicked; and he does not therefore contradict the positive assertion of his pupil, that their punishments will be eternal. See Bp. Kaye on Justin, c. 5, p. 102.

15. ὡς ἐκεῖνος ἔφη. See Plato de Repub. X. (vol. VII. p. 324, ed. Bipont.); Phædr. (vol. X. p. 326.)

17. ἥδε ἡ πλάνη. This is the correct reading of the MSS. The ed. Bened. has ἡ δὲ πλάνη. With respect to the entire sentence, the sure and elegant emendation of Thirlby has been admitted without hesitation. Previously the pointing was at ἡμᾶς instead of τις, and the ensuing clause ran thus—ἡ δὲ πλάνη ἐστὶν ἄλλου πρὸς ἕτερον, μέχρις οὗ κ. τ. λ. It is needless to record the different expositions which have been offered of this passage, as it thus stood. The most plausible was that of Thalemann, after Maranus, who regarded the words πλάνη ἄλλου πρὸς ἕτερον as equivalent to πλάνη ἀλλοπρόσαλλος, *an error of daily occurrence;* comparing the line of argument employed by Justin in cc. 20–22, and Tertull. Apol. c. 21, *Recipite interim hanc fabulam; similis est vestris.* Even admitting, what is extremely doubtful, that the expression will bear this meaning, the emendation

Neither, again, are Christians Atheists, because they do not worship idols; inasmuch as these are only the work of men's hands, and are made frequently of the vilest materials; so that they are not only incapable of protecting others, but require protection themselves against robbers.

IX. Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ θυσίαις πολλαῖς καὶ πλοκαῖς ἀνθῶν τιμῶμεν, οὓς ἄνθρωποι μορφώσαντες, καὶ ἐν ναοῖς ἱδρύσαντες, θεοὺς προσωνόμασαν· ἐπεὶ ἄψυχα καὶ νεκρὰ ταῦτα γινώσκομεν, καὶ Θεοῦ μορφὴν μὴ ἔχοντα,—οὐ γὰρ τοιαύτην ἡγούμεθα τὸν Θεὸν ἔχειν τὴν μορφήν, ἥν φασί τινες εἰς τιμὴν μεμιμῆσθαι,—ἀλλ' ἐκείνων τῶν φανέντων κακῶν δαιμόνων καὶ ὀνόματα καὶ σχήματα ἔχειν. Τί γὰρ δεῖ εἰδόσιν ὑμῖν λέγειν, ἃ τὴν ὕλην οἱ τεχνῖται διατιθέασι ξέοντες καὶ τέμνοντες, καὶ χωνεύοντες καὶ τύπτοντες; Καὶ ἐξ ἀτίμων πολλάκις σκευῶν διὰ τέχνης τὸ σχῆμα μόνον ἀλλάξαντες, καὶ μορφοποιήσαντες, θεοὺς ἐπονομάζουσιν· ὅπερ οὐ μόνον ἄλογον ἡγούμεθα, ἀλλὰ

which has been adopted is so greatly preferable, and the change in the text so very slight, that no reasonable doubt can be entertained on the subject. Precisely similar is Job xix. 4, (LXX.)—ναὶ δὴ ἐπ' ἀληθείας ἐγὼ ἐπλανήθην, παρ' ἐμοὶ δ' αὐλίζεται πλάνος.

IX. 1. Cod. Reg. τιμωμένους. It would require no great sagacity to determine the true reading which the Benedictine editor obtained from Cod. Clar. And yet there have not been wanting conjectures on the supposition that the participle should be retained; which, as might be expected, are splendid specimens of ingenious nonsense. The masculine relative οὓς is used with reference to θεούς, and the neuter ταῦτα, in the following clause, with reference, κατὰ τὸ σημαινόμενον, to the *idols*, εἴδωλα, which represent them.

5. ἥν φασί τινες κ. τ. λ. *Which some suppose to have been imitated to his honour;* that is, by the imitation of which they suppose that he is duly represented and worshipped. Not perceiving that this remark is parenthetical, *Perionius* needlessly proposed to read, οὐ γὰρ τοιαῦτα ἡγούμεθα τοῦ θεοῦ ἔχειν κ. τ. λ., so that it might be taken in connexion with ἀλλ' ἐκείνων κ. τ. λ.

8. ἅ. Scil. σχήματα. *Into what* forms *the craftsmen arrange*, or *fashion, the materials.* The two accusatives are analogous to an idiom of our own, according to which we should say, *they make the wood a god.* The following participles doubtless suggested the enquiry in Pseudo-Clem. Hom. x. 8, πῶς θεοί εἰσιν κλεπτόμενοι, χωνευόμενοι, σταθμιζόμενοι, φρουρούμενοι; Both Justin and Clement doubtless had their thoughts upon the beautiful passage of Isaiah (xliv. 9, sqq.) on the vanity of idols and idol-makers; and arguments to the same effect will be found in Ps. cxv. 4. sqq., cxxxv. 15. sqq.; Wisd. cc. xiii.–xv.; Epist. ad Diognet. c. 2; Athenag. Legat. c. 26; Theoph. Ant. ad Autol. II.; Arnob. adv. Gent. VI. 14; Clem. Alex. Protrept. IV. 51; Strom. VII. 5, 28; Tertull. Apol. c. 12; Chrysost. in Gen. Hom. 32; Jerom. in Esai. XLIV.; August. Civ. D. VIII. 23. See also Herod. II. 172; Tibull. Eleg. I. 10; Propert. El. II. 4.

9. μορφοποιήσαντες. H. Steph. would insert ἀνθρώπους or ἀνθρώπων εἰκόνας either *before* or *after* this participle; which, however, like the synonym μορφώσαντες above, is used *absolutely* by Justin. Besides not men only, but in some countries, as in Egypt for example, beasts, birds, and reptiles were frequent objects of idolatrous worship. See c. 24.

καὶ ἐφ' ὕβρει τοῦ Θεοῦ γίνεσθαι, ὃς, ἄρρητον δόξαν καὶ μορφὴν ἔχων, ἐπὶ φθαρτοῖς καὶ δεομένοις θεραπείας πράγμασιν ἐπονομάζεται. Καὶ ὅτι οἱ τούτων τεχνῖται ἀσελγεῖς τε καὶ πᾶσαν κακίαν, ἵνα μὴ καταριθμῶμεν, ἔχουσιν, ἀκριβῶς ἐπίστασθε· καὶ τὰς ἑαυτῶν παιδίσκας συνεργαζομένας φθείρουσιν. Ὦ τῆς ἐμβροντησίας, ἀνθρώπους ἀκολάστους θεοὺς εἰς τὸ προσκυνεῖσθαι πλάσσειν λέγεσθαι καὶ μεταποιεῖν, καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν, ἔνθα ἀνατίθενται, φύλακας τοιούτους καθιστάναι· μὴ συνορῶντας ἀθέμιτον καὶ τὸ νοεῖν ἢ λέγειν ἀνθρώπους θεῶν εἶναι φύλακας.

X. Ἀλλ' οὐ δέεσθαι τῆς παρὰ ἀνθρώπων ὑλικῆς προσφορᾶς προσειλήφαμεν τὸν Θεὸν, αὐτὸν παρέχοντα πάντα ὁρῶντες· ἐκείνους δὲ προσδέχεσθαι αὐτὸν μόνον δεδιδάγμεθα, καὶ πεπείσμεθα, καὶ πιστεύομεν, τοὺς τὰ προσόντα αὐτῷ ἀγαθὰ μιμουμένους, σωφροσύνην καὶ δικαιοσύνην καὶ φιλανθρωπίαν, καὶ ὅσα οἰκεῖα Θεῷ ἐστι, τῷ μηδενὶ ὀνόματι θετῷ

And as to material offerings, they know that God does not require them, being himself the Creator of all things; but that those who strive to imitate the divine perfection, are accepted in his sight, and will reign with him in the enjoyment of a happy immortality.

18. Codd. et ed. Steph. *λέγεσθε*. In subsequent editions the conjectural emendation of Stephens has been adopted.

21. *θεῶν φύλακας*. Epist. ad Diog. c. 2, *τοὺς μὲν λιθίνους καὶ ὀστρακίνους σέβοντες ἀφυλάκτους, τοὺς δὲ ἀργυρέους καὶ χρυσοῦς ἐγκλείοντες ταῖς νυξὶ, καὶ ταῖς ἡμέραις φύλακας παρακαθίσαντες, ἵνα μὴ κλαπῶσιν.* Pseudo-Clem. Hom. x. 8, *εἰ ὄντως ἔμπνοα ἦν τὰ σεβάσματα ὑμῶν, τοὺς αὐτοῖς ἐπιβουλεῦσαι θέλοντας καὶ κλέπτοντας ἀπεωθεῖτο ἄν· νῦν δὲ τούτων οὐδὲν ποιοῦσιν· ἀλλ' ὡς κατάδικοι, καὶ μάλιστα οἱ τιμιώτεροι αὐτῶν, φρουροῦνται.* Compare Baruch vi. 17; Tertull. Apol. c. 29; De Cor. Milit. c. 11; Cyprian. c. Demetr. c. 14.

X. 1. *δέεσθαι*. Thalemann would read *δεῖσθαι*. There is a like sentiment in Tertull. ad Scap. c. 2, *Itaque et sacrificamus,....sed quomodo præcepit Deus*, pura prece. *Non enim eget Deus, conditor universitatis, odoris aut sanguinis alicujus. Hæc enim dæmoniorum pabula sunt.* Compare Athenag. Legat. c. 13; Arnob. c. Gent. vi. 2; Clem. Alex. Strom. vii.; Origen. c. Cels. iii.; Minuc. F. Oct. c. 32; Augustin. Civ. D. x. 4. See also Rom. xii. 1.

2. *προσειλήφαμεν*. *We have received by tradition:* in which sense this verb is used again in this chapter, and frequently elsewhere by Justin, when speaking of any doctrine *traditionally* derived from Christ or his Apostles. The substitution therefore of *προειλήφαμεν* or *παρειλήφαμεν*, as proposed by Sylburg and Thalemann respectively, is altogether needless. In c. 19, *προειλήφαμεν* has a very different meaning.

6. *τῷ μηδενὶ ὀνόματι θ. κ.* Infra, c. 61, *ὄνομα γὰρ τῷ ἀρρήτῳ Θεῷ οὐδεὶς ἔχει εἰπεῖν· εἰ δέ τις τολμήσειεν εἶναι λέγειν, μέμηνε τὴν ἄσωτον μανίαν.* The same notion is advanced in Cohort. ad Græc. c. 21; Apol. ii. c. 6. To the same effect is the reply of the martyr Attalus, in Euseb. H. E. v. 1, *ὁ Θεὸς ὄνομα οὐκ ἔχει, ὡς ἄνθρωπος.* Compare, however, Exod. iii. 13, 14; and see Bishop Kaye's Justin, pp. 8, 56.

καλουμένῳ. Καὶ πάντα τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀγαθὸν ὄντα δημιουργῆσαι αὐτὸν ἐξ ἀμόρφου ὕλης δι' ἀνθρώπους δεδιδάγμεθα, οἳ, ἐὰν ἀξίους τῷ ἐκείνου βουλεύματι ἑαυτοὺς δι' ἔργων δείξωσι, τῆς μετ' αὐτοῦ ἀναστροφῆς καταξιωθῆναι προσειλήφαμεν συμβασιλεύοντας, ἀφθάρτους καὶ ἀπαθεῖς γενομένους. Ὃν τρόπον γὰρ τὴν ἀρχὴν οὐκ ὄντας ἐποίησε, τὸν αὐτὸν ἡγούμεθα τρόπον, διὰ τὸ ἑλέσθαι τοὺς αἱρουμένους τὰ αὐτῷ ἀρεστὰ, καὶ ἀφθαρσίας καὶ συνουσίας καταξιωθῆναι· τὸ μὲν γὰρ τὴν ἀρχὴν γενέσθαι, οὐχ ἡμέτερον ἦν· τὸ δ' ἐξακολουθῆσαι οἷς

7. *τὴν ἀρχήν*. *In the beginning.* That this is the true import of the expression there can be no doubt, not only from the manner in which it is twice repeated in this chapter, but also from the very similar passage in c. 59, *πῶς τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ ἐκ τίνων ἐδημιούργησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν κόσμον, ἔφη οὕτως· Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν* (Gen. I. 1). Compare Gen. xiii. 4, xliii. 19, 20; Dan. viii. 1; Æsch. D. Socr. II. 19. Braunius, however, would render it *wholly, altogether;* taken, of course, in connexion with *ἀγαθὸν ὄντα*. This sense it undoubtedly bears in numberless instances; and even without a negation, which has been thought essential to the usage, and as it occurs in c. 19; Herod. III. 16; Xen. Cyr. I. 2, 3; Symp. I. 15; Æsch. D. Socr. III. 4. Compare Herod. I. 9; and see Wolf ad Demosth. c. Lept. p. 278. At the same time, it may fairly be questioned whether such is its meaning, as Br. maintains, in John viii. 25, *ἔλεγον οὖν αὐτῷ, Σὺ τίς εἶ; καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Τὴν ἀρχὴν ὅ, τι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν.* See the Commentators.

8. *ἐξ ἀμόρφου ὕλης.* *Infra*, c. 59, *ὕλην ἄμορφον ὄντα στρέψαντα τὸν Θεὸν κόσμον ποιῆσαι.* It is not to be inferred from hence that Justin maintained the eternity of matter. He merely asserts, that from a *rudis indigestaque moles*, previously called into existence out of nothing, God created the universe. See Augustin. de Mirab. Script. I. 1. That such is his meaning is clear from Dial. Tryph. c. 11, *τοῦ ποιήσαντος καὶ διατάξαντος τόδε τὸ πᾶν Θεοῦ.* Compare Apol. I. c. 20, II. c. 6. With respect to the divine purpose of creating the world for the benefit of mankind, such was also the general opinion of the early Fathers. See Herm. Past. II. 12, 4; Epist. ad Diogn. c. 10; Tatian. c. Græc. c 4; Athenag. Legat. c. 13; Theophil. ad Autol. I. 4; Iren. Hær. IV. 28; Tertull. c. Marc. I. 13; Clem. Alex. Strom. VIII.; Origen. c. Cels. IV. 74; Lactant. Inst. Div. VII. 3.

9. *ἀξίους τῷ ἐκείνου βουλεύματι.* That is, *with respect to his counsel.* So Xen. Mem. I. 1, *ἄξιός ἐστι θανάτου τῇ πόλει.* Compare Herod. VII. 5; Soph. Œd. C. 1446; and see Matth. Gr. Gr. §. 363, *Obs.* and §. 387; Porson ad Eur. Hec. 313. For *βουλεύματι* Sylburg proposes to read *βουλήματι*; and that these words are sometimes confused, see Lobeck ad Soph. A. p. 228. Here, however, the sense would manifestly be injured by the change. Neither is *συμβασιλεύσοντας*, another conjecture of the same editor, more likely to have proceeded from Justin than the reading exhibited in the text.

15. *τὸ δ' ἐξακολουθῆσαι κ. τ. λ.* In drawing this comparison between his creation, in which the will had no share, and his conversion to faith and obedience by his own rational energies, Justin clearly regards man as an intelligent and

φίλον αὐτῷ, αἱρουμένους δι' ὧν αὐτὸς ἐδωρήσατο λογικῶν δυνάμεων, πείθει τε καὶ εἰς πίστιν ἄγει ἡμᾶς. Καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἡγούμεθα εἶναι τῷ μὴ εἴργεσθαι ταῦτα μανθάνειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ προτρέπεσθαι ἐπὶ ταῦτα. Ἅπερ γὰρ οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν οἱ ἀνθρώπειοι νόμοι πρᾶξαι, ταῦτα ὁ λόγος θεῖος ὢν εἰργάσατο, εἰ μὴ οἱ φαῦλοι δαίμονες κατεσκέδασαν πολλὰ ψευδῆ καὶ ἄθεα κατηγορήματα, σύμμαχον λαβόντες τὴν ἐν ἑκάστῳ κακὴν πρὸς πάντα καὶ ποικίλην φύσει ἐπιθυμίαν, ὧν οὐδὲν πρόσεστιν ἡμῖν.

The kingdom which they expect, however, is not an earthly, but an heavenly one: which appears at once from their readiness to die in order to obtain it.

XI. Καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀκούσαντες βασιλείαν προσδοκῶντας ἡμᾶς, ἀκρίτως ἀνθρώπινον λέγειν ἡμᾶς ὑπειλήφατε, ἡμῶν τὴν

responsible being, with the capacity of choosing between good and evil, but guided in making the choice by preventing grace, or something like it. At the same time he laments an innate proneness to evil acting in various ways, of which the dæmons take advantage to counteract the influence of the divine word. See, however, on this intricate subject, Bp. Kaye on Justin, chap. 3, pp. 75, sqq.; and compare John vii. 17.

18. τῷ μὴ εἴργεσθαι. *In respect to their not being restrained.* See Matth. Gr. Gr. §. 387. At the same time, though the change may not be absolutely necessary, those who would read τὸ, in the accusative, are probably correct.

19. ἅπερ. Vulgo ὅπερ. Hence Grabe suggested the change of ταῦτα into τοῦτο: but the emendation of Davies, adopted by *Braunius* and *Otto*, is greatly preferable.

20. ταῦτα ὁ λόγος θεῖος ὢν εἰργάσατο. Some would substitute ἂν for ὢν, but the form would then have been ὁ θεῖος λόγος: and Justin's attention to the use of the particle ἂν is not such as to warrant its insertion or omission at random. On the other hand, he frequently employs the participle ὢν precisely as in this passage; of which an example occurs immediately above in the sentence, καὶ πάντα τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀγαθὸν ὄντα κ. τ. λ. Neither is ὢν in such cases to be treated as redundant; for the expression does not here mean simply *the divine Word*, but *the Word as being divine*. Thirlby and others would read Θεὸς for θεῖος, and Bp. Kaye seems disposed to sanction the emendation.

24. ὧν οὐδὲν πρόσεστιν ἡμῖν. *Scil.* κατηγορημάτων, *the accusations*, namely, of Atheism, incest, &c. There seems to have been some casual transposition of this clause; and probably the entire sentence originally ran thus: εἰ μὴ οἱ φ. δαίμονες, σύμμαχον λαβόντες τὴν ἐν ἐκ. κ. π. π. καὶ π. φ. ἐπιθυμίαν, κατεσκέδασαν πολλὰ κ. τ. λ. A copyist, having omitted a clause, would probably insert it in a wrong connexion, and thus the error would be perpetuated.

XI. 2. ἀκρίτως. *Without discrimination* or *enquiry*. Hegesippus (ap. Euseb. H. E. III. 20.) relates that Domitian, hearing that the Christians were looking forward to a kingdom of their own, summoned to his presence the grandsons of Judas, the kinsman of our Lord, in order to satisfy himself of the correctness of the statement: and the examination, to which they were subjected, bore entirely upon the report which had alarmed the tyrant and awakened his jealousy.

μετὰ Θεοῦ λεγόντων, ὡς καὶ ἐκ τοῦ τοὺς ἀνεταζομένους ὑφ' ὑμῶν ὁμολογεῖν εἶναι Χριστιανοὺς, γινώσκοντες τῷ ὁμολογοῦντι θάνατον τὴν ζημίαν κεῖσθαι, φαίνεται. Εἰ γὰρ ἀνθρώπινον βασιλείαν προσεδοκῶμεν, κἂν ἠρνούμεθα ὅπως μὴ ἀναιρώμεθα, καὶ λανθάνειν ἐπειρώμεθα ὅπως τῶν προσδοκωμένων τύχωμεν· ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ οὐκ εἰς τὸ νῦν τὰς ἐλπίδας ἔχομεν, ἀναιρούντων οὐ πεφροντίκαμεν, τοῦ καὶ πάντως ἀποθανεῖν ὀφειλομένου.

So far indeed are they from any revolutionary intentions, that they assist in promoting the public peace; and their persecutors seem to fear that their exertions will leave them no offenders to punish. Christ, however, has promised to sustain them under their sufferings, for which he prepared them by his predictions.

XII. Ἀρωγοὶ δ' ὑμῖν καὶ σύμμαχοι πρὸς εἰρήνην ἐσμὲν πάντων μᾶλλον ἀνθρώπων, οἳ ταῦτα δοξάζομεν, ὡς λαθεῖν

3. *τοὺς ἀνεταζομένους*. The article has been inserted, after Thalemann, in order to the grammatical accuracy of the text. It may easily have been omitted by the copyists, from the similarity of the *τοῦ* preceding. A like consideration would probably justify the substitution of *γινώσκοντας* for *γινώσκοντες*. Similar transitions, however, from the *accusative* to the *nominative*, have been adduced from the Cohort. ad Græc. cc. 4, 7. Perhaps indeed it might be as well in these instances also to read *ἐναντίους* and *δυνηθέντας*.

8. *εἰς τὸ νῦν*. Thirlby prefers *τὰ νῦν* in the plural.

9. *ἀναιρούντων οὐ πεφροντίκαμεν*. Justin himself affords a striking example of this in his own martyrdom. See Act. Mart. cc. 4, 5. Assertions to the same effect are found also in Apol. I. cc. 39, 57, II. c. 4; Dial. Tryph. cc. 46, 96, 110, 121. Compare Tertull. ad Scap. cc. 1, 5. Indeed the very heathen withheld not their testimony to the contempt with which the Martyrs looked upon death, as the entrance upon a life of immortality. Thus Lucian. de Mort. Peregrin. c. 13, *πεπείκασιν αὑτοὺς οἱ κακοδαίμονες τὸ μὲν ὅλον ἀθάνατοι ἔσεσθαι καὶ βιώσεσθαι τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον· παρ' ὃ καὶ καταφρονοῦσι τοῦ θανάτου, καὶ ἑκόντες αὑτοὺς ἐπιδιδόασιν οἱ πολλοί.*

9. *τοῦ καὶ πάντως ἀπ. ὀφειλομένου*. Apol. I. c. 57, *οὐ γὰρ δεδοίκαμεν θάνατον, τοῦ πάντως ἀποθανεῖν ὁμολογουμένου*. Apol. II. c. 11, *εἰ μὴ πάντως παντὶ γενομένῳ ἀνθρώπῳ καὶ θανεῖν ὠφείλετο*. In the text, and also in the first of the above citations, *Grabe* would insert *παντὸς*, which he supposes to have been omitted by some ignorant copyist, in consequence of *πάντως* preceding; and he supports his conjecture by alleging the second citation. It is clear, however, that *παντὶ*, rather than *παντὸς*, would thus be required; and in fact *παντὸς* is inadmissible. Equally inadmissible, and far less plausible, is *σώματος*, the conjecture of H. Stephens. It might have been that the participle *ὀφειλομένου* had arisen out of *ὁμολογουμένου*, and that *ὀφείλεσθαι* (*subaud.* *ἕνεκα*) was the original reading. There is no reason, however, to suppose that the text is not correct. The meaning is, *inasmuch as at all events death is a debt which must be paid:* and the construction is that of the *gen. absol.* Most of the Commentators do not seem to have understood that *τοῦ ἀποθανεῖν* is the *locum tenens* of a substantive with which *ὀφειλομένου*, and in c. 57, *ὁμολογουμένου*, agree; but to have regarded *ἀποθανεῖν* as an infinitive dependent upon these participles.

XII. 1. *ἀρωγοί*. Ed. Steph. *ἀῤῥωγοί*.

Θεὸν κακόεργον, ἢ πλεονέκτην, ἢ ἐπίβουλον, ἢ ἐνάρετον, ἀδύνατον εἶναι, καὶ ἕκαστον ἐπ' αἰωνίαν κόλασιν ἢ σωτηρίαν κατ' ἀξίαν τῶν πράξεων πορεύεσθαι. Εἰ γὰρ οἱ πάντες ἄνθρωποι ταῦτα ἐγίνωσκον, οὐκ ἄν τις τὴν κακίαν πρὸς ὀλίγον ᾑρεῖτο, γινώσκων πορεύεσθαι ἐπ' αἰωνίαν διὰ πυρὸς καταδίκην· ἀλλ' ἐκ παντὸς τρόπου ἑαυτὸν συνεῖχε, καὶ ἐκόσμει ἀρετῇ, ὅπως τῶν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τύχῃ ἀγαθῶν, καὶ τῶν κολαστηρίων ἀπηλλαγμένος εἴη. Οἱ γὰρ διὰ τοὺς ὑφ' ὑμῶν κειμένους νόμους καὶ κολάσεις πειρῶνται λανθάνειν ἀδικοῦντες· ἀνθρώπους δ' ὄντας λανθάνειν ὑμᾶς δυνατὸν ἐπιστάμενοι ἀδικοῦσιν, εἰ ἔμαθον καὶ ἐπείσθησαν Θεὸν ἀδύνατον εἶναι λαθεῖν τι, οὐ μόνον πραττόμενον, ἀλλὰ καὶ βουλευόμενον, κἂν διὰ τὰ ἐπικείμενα ἐκ παντὸς τρόπου κόσμιοι ἦσαν, ὡς καὶ ὑμεῖς συμφήσετε. Ἀλλ' ἐοίκατε δεδιέναι μὴ πάντες

3. ἐνάρετον. See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 328.

9. τύχῃ. It has been proposed to read τύχοι, in order to a correspondence with εἴη following. Justin, however, is notoriously inaccurate in such matters. See above, on c. 2, 21.

10. οἱ γὰρ διὰ τοὺς ὑφ' ὑμῶν κ. τ. λ. *For* those who, *by reason* of the *laws and punishments which you impose, endeavour to escape detection* when they offend, *and offend too under the conviction that they may escape the notice of human beings like yourselves: would, if they had learned and were persuaded that intentions, as well as deeds, were alike known to God, by all means live decently*, by reason *of the penalties annexed to their transgression.* That such is the sense of the passage, which has woefully perplexed the Commentators, is abundantly evident from the antithetical expressions, διὰ τοὺς ὑφ' ὑμῶν κειμένους ν. καὶ κολάσεις and διὰ τὰ ἐπικείμενα, *scil.* ὑπὸ Θεοῦ. The reading of the MSS. is οὐ γὰρ, which is absolute nonsense: and, though something like sense is obtained by placing, not exactly with Braunius, a note of interrogation at ἀδικοῦντες, but at ἀδικοῦσιν, still Thirlby's emendation, οἱ for οὐ, is palpably correct. The same sentiment is expressed in Pseudo-Clem. Hom. IV. 23, ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἔχων πρὸς ἄνθρωπον τὸν σκόπον, ἐλπίδι τοῦ λαθεῖν τολμήσει ἁμαρτάνειν· ὁ δὲ Θεὸν παντοπόπτην τῇ ἑαυτοῦ ψυχῇ ὁρισάμενος, εἰδὼς αὐτὸν λαθεῖν μὴ δύνασθαι, καὶ τὸ λάθρα ἁμαρτεῖν παραιτήσεται. Compare also Tertull. Apol. c. 45; Minuc. F. Oct. c. 10; Lactant. Inst. Div. v. 8; De Ira. c. 8.

16. ὡς καὶ ὑμεῖς συμφήσετε. *Vulgo* ἡμεῖς. Of the two proposed emendations, ὑμεῖς and ἡμῖν, the former, approved by Grabe and adopted by Braunius, is manifestly correct.

— ἀλλ' ἐοίκατε δεδιέναι κ. τ. λ. There is a degree of impetuosity in some parts of Justin's address, which has been thought to bear some resemblance to the freedom of rebuke, which was exercised by the antient Prophets. At all events their respective positions were very different; and those who spoke as the immediate oracles of God would be justified in the use of language which is scarcely becoming in an appeal from a subject to his sovereign. It seems, however, to

δικαιοπραγήσωσι, καὶ ὑμεῖς οὓς κολάζητε ἔτι οὐχ ἕξετε· δημίων δ' ἂν εἴη τὸ τοιοῦτον ἔργον, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀρχόντων ἀγαθῶν. Πεπείσμεθα δ' ἐκ δαιμόνων φαύλων, οἳ καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἀλόγως βιούντων αἰτοῦσι θύματα καὶ θεραπείας, καὶ ταῦτα, ὡς προέφημεν, ἐνεργεῖσθαι· ἀλλ' οὐχ ὑμᾶς, οἵ γε εὐσεβείας καὶ φιλοσοφίας ὀρέγεσθε, ἄλογόν τι πρᾶξαι ὑπειλήφαμεν. Εἰ δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς ὁμοίως τοῖς ἀνοήτοις τὰ ἔθη πρὸ τῆς ἀληθείας τιμᾶτε, πράττετε ὃ δύνασθε. Τοσοῦτον δὲ δύνανται καὶ ἄρχοντες πρὸ τῆς ἀληθείας δόξαν τιμῶντες, ὅσον καὶ λῃσταὶ ἐν ἐρημίᾳ. Ὅτι δ' οὐ καλλιερήσετε ὁ λόγος ἀποδείκνυσιν, οὗ βασιλικώτατον καὶ δικαιότατον ἄρχοντα, μετὰ τὸν γεννήσαντα Θεὸν, οὐδένα οἴδαμεν ὄντα. Ὃν γὰρ τρόπον διαδέχεσθαι πενίας, ἢ πάθη, ἢ ἀδοξίας πατρικὰς ὑφαιροῦνται πάντες, οὕτως καὶ ὅσα ἂν ὑπαγορεύσῃ ὁ λόγος μὴ δεῖν αἱρεῖσθαι, ὁ νουνεχὴς οὐχ αἱρήσεται. Γενήσεσθαι ταῦτα πάντα προεῖπε, φημὶ, ὁ ἡμέτερος διδάσκαλος, καὶ τοῦ

have been a right assumed by the Apologists generally, to express themselves warmly and without reserve. Compare Tertull. Apol. c. 25; Minuc. F. Oct. c. 25. The MSS. and early Edd. give κολάζετε. Edd. Sylb. Br. Ott. κολάσετε. With some hesitation, κολάζητε has been preferred. Properly δήμιος is an adjective; but Plato (Legg. IX.) uses it, with δοῦλος understood, to denote *a public executioner.*

19. ἐκ δαιμόνων φαύλων κ. τ. λ. See the chapter on *Dæmons*, in Bp. Kaye's Justin.

20. καὶ ταῦτα. These causeless persecutions. See above, c. 5.

21. οἵ γε εὐσεβείας καὶ φ. ὀρέγ. *Who aim at a reputation for piety and philosophy.* There is an allusion to the appellations by which the Antonines were distinguished. See above, c. 2. For πρᾶξαι, H. Steph. would read πράξειν, in the future; but without reason. See Krüger on Xen. Anab. I. 2. 2.

24. τοσοῦτον δὲ κ. τ. λ. This sentence, with the first καὶ omitted, is cited by *Joannes Damascenus* in his Parall. Sacr. I. 98. Its purport is equivalent to what is said in c. 2, ὑμεῖς δ' ἀποκτεῖναι μὲν δύνασθε, βλάψαι δ' οὔ. Compare also c. 45.

26. ὅτι δ' οὐ καλλιερήσετε κ. τ. λ. The verb καλλιερεῖν signifies properly *to sacrifice with favourable omens;* and thence generally *to succeed, to prevail.* See Passow's Lexic. in v. Justin's meaning therefore is, that their persecutors will not succeed in their attempts against the Christians, since Christ himself has promised to support them in making a wise choice; at the same time that their faith is confirmed by the fact, that their very sufferings are so many fulfilments of his predictions, and consequently so many proofs of his divinity.

27. οὗ βασιλικώτατον καὶ δικαιότατον. The MSS. and most Edd. read οὐ, for which Thalemann at length, and after him Braunius and Otto, have properly restored the relative οὗ. Of the superlative, used in the sense of the comparative, there are similar examples in the Cohort. ad Græc. cc. 9, 12, 21, 35. See Matth. Gr. Gr. §. 464; Brunck. ad Soph. Œd. T. 58; Hermann. ad Viger. p. 718.

πατρὸς πάντων καὶ δεσπότου Θεοῦ υἱὸς καὶ ἀπόστολος ὤν, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ τὸ Χριστιανοὶ ἐπονομάζεσθαι ἐσχήκαμεν· ὅθεν καὶ βέβαιοι γινόμεθα πρὸς τὰ δεδιδαγμένα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ πάντα, ἐπειδὴ ἔργῳ φαίνεται γινόμενα, ὅσα φθάσας γενέσθαι προεῖπεν· ὅπερ Θεοῦ ἔργον ἐστὶ, πρὶν ἢ γενέσθαι εἰπεῖν, καὶ οὕτως δειχθῆναι γινόμενον, ὡς προείρηται. Ἦν μὲν οὖν καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις παυσαμένους μηδὲν προστιθέναι, λογισαμένους ὅτι δίκαιά τε καὶ ἀληθῆ ἀξιοῦμεν· ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ γνωρίζομεν οὐ ῥᾷον ἀγνοίᾳ κατεχομένην ψυχὴν συντόμως μεταβάλλειν, ὑπὲρ τοῦ πεῖσαι τοὺς φιλαλήθεις μικρὰ προσθεῖναι προεθυμήθημεν, εἰδότες ὅτι οὐκ ἀδύνατον, ἀληθείας παρατεθείσης, ἄγνοιαν φυγεῖν.

XIII. Ἄθεοι μὲν οὖν ὡς οὐκ ἐσμεν, τὸν δημιουργὸν τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς σεβόμενοι· ἀνενδεῆ αἱμάτων καὶ σπονδῶν καὶ θυμιαμάτων, ὡς ἐδιδάχθημεν, λέγοντες· λόγῳ εὐχῆς καὶ εὐ-

Reverting to the charge of *Atheism*, Justin again repels it by shewing that the object of the Christian's worship is the ever-blessed Trinity; to whom indeed they do not offer *material* sacrifices, but the spiritual oblations of prayer, and thanks-givings, and mutual benevolence.

32. προεῖπε Χριστός. See Matt. x. 16, sqq., xxiv. 9; John xv. 20. Justin adverts to the confirmation which the faith of Christians received from the fulfilment of our Saviour's prophecies, and almost in the same terms, in the Dial. Tryph. c. 35. Christ is here called Θεοῦ ἀπόστολος, as in Heb. iii. 1. The title is applied to him with reference to those passages in which he is described as *sent by God*. Compare John v. 38, vi. 29, xvii. 18.

38. εἰπεῖν. *Vulgo*, εἶπε. The infinitive, which previous editors unanimously approved, Otto properly admitted into the text, alleging that the common reading may have arisen from a copyist casually glancing at προεῖπε, which he had written a few lines before.

40. ἐπεὶ γνωρίζομεν οὐ ῥᾷον κ. τ. λ. Irenæus has borrowed this sentiment, in his work *adv. Hæres*. III. 2, *Si non facile est ab errore apprehensam resipiscere animam, sed non omnimodo impossibile est errorem effugere, apposita veritate.*

XIII. 2. ἀνενδεῆ αἱμάτων κ. τ. λ. Compare Acts xvii. 25. To the same effect are many passages in the Patristical writings. Thus Clem. Rom. Epist. ad Cor. c. 52, ἀπροσδεὴς, ἀδελφοί, δεσπότης ὑπάρχει τῶν ἁπάντων, οὐδὲ οὐδενὸς χρῄζει, εἰ μὴ τοῦ ἐξομολογεῖσθαι αὐτῷ. Clem. Alex. Strom. VII. οὐ θύομεν εἰκότως ἀνενδεεῖ τῷ Θεῷ, τῷ τὰ πάντα τοῖς πᾶσι παρεσχημένῳ· τὸν δὲ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἱερευθέντα δοξάζομεν, σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ἱερεύοντες εἴς τε τὸ ἀνενδεὲς ἐκ τοῦ ἀνενδεοῦς. See also Athenag. Legat. c. 14; Clem. Alex. Pædag. III. 1; Tract. cui tit. *Quis dives salv.* I. 27; Iren. Hær. IV. 34; Tertull. ad Scap. c. 2; Lactant. Inst. Div. VI. 25. A like sentiment is found in many Pagan authors. Thus Eur. Herc. F. 1348, Δεῖται γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς, εἴπερ ἔστ' ὄντως θεὸς, Οὐδενός. Compare Xen. Mem. I. 3; Procul. ad Platon. Theol. c. 19; Lucret. I. 56.

3. εὐχῆς καὶ εὐχαριστίας. It has been thought that the *Eucharist* is here referred to; and Grabe renders ἐφ' οἷς προσφερόμεθα πᾶσιν in an active sense, *in oblationibus quas offerimus omnibus.* The words, however, should be rendered, *for all things wherewith we are supplied;* and this is manifest from the use of

χαριστίας ἐφ' οἷς προσφερόμεθα πᾶσιν, ὅση δύναμις, αἰνοῦντες· μόνην ἀξίαν αὐτοῦ τιμὴν ταύτην παραλαβόντες τὸ τὰ ὑπ' ἐκείνου εἰς διατροφὴν γενόμενα οὐ πυρὶ δαπανᾷν, ἀλλ' ἑαυτοῖς καὶ τοῖς δεομένοις προσφέρειν, ἐκείνῳ δὲ εὐχαρίστους ὄντας διὰ λόγου πομπὰς καὶ ὕμνους πέμπειν ὑπέρ τε τοῦ γεγονέναι, καὶ τῶν εἰς εὐρωστίαν πόρων πάντων, ποιοτήτων

the active verb in the next period. Though *prayer to God* and *charity towards mankind* are spoken of in the close of the Apology (cc. 65, 67) as the two great requisites of the *spiritual* sacrifice of the Christian, in connexion with the Lord's Supper, they are here simply opposed, without reference to that sacrament, to the *material* sacrifices of the heathen. Compare Tertull. contra Jud. c. 5; adv. Marcion. III. 22, IV. 1; Greg. Naz. Orat. 42; Clem. Alex. Strom. VII.; Euseb. Dem. Ev. I. 6, 10, III. 4, 5; Cyprian. adv. Jud. I. 16; Ambros. Epist. 28; Cyril. adv. Julian. IX.

4. ὅση δύναμις. *To the utmost of his power.* So again, in c. 67, ὁ προεστὼς εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας, ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ, ἀναπέμπει. The expression seems clearly to imply that these prayers and praises were offered up in a *clear* and *audible* voice. It has been argued, indeed, by Lord Chancellor KING, in his *Inquiry into the Constitution, &c. of the Primitive Church* (Part II. c. 2, §. 7), from the use of the same or equivalent expressions by *Origen*, that it includes the exertion of *personal abilities*, such as *understanding, memory*, and *invention;* and an inference is thence deduced against the existence of *prescribed forms of prayer* among the early Christians. That no such conclusion can be legitimately drawn, will be seen at once from a perusal of the note in Professor BLUNT's *Introductory Lectures on the Early Fathers*, p. 16.

6. οὐ πυρὶ δαπανᾶν κ. τ. λ. Justin observes that, while the heathen consume by fire, and therefore waste, the productions of nature intended for the support of life, Christians employed them for their own sustenance, and for the relief of their brethren; and that they never partook of food without expressing their gratitude for their creation and preservation, for the gifts of providence, and the changes of the seasons whereby they were produced. Compare Tertull. c. 39; Chrysost. Hom. in Matt. xiv. t. II. p. 314; Cyprian. ad. Donat. *sub fine.*

8. πομπὰς καὶ ὕμνους. Grabe, and it should seem correctly, understands πομπὰς to be *solemn prayers;* observing that this sense is analogous to that in which the word is applied to an eloquent display of oratory, as in Plat. Axioc. t. XI. p. 192. (ed. Bipont.) He also remarks that the ὕμνοι were either *Psalms of David*, or some of those ψαλμοὶ καὶ ᾠδαὶ ἀδελφῶν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὑπὸ πιστῶν γραφεῖσαι, which are mentioned by an anonymous writer in Euseb. H. E. v. 28. The earliest specimen of a Christian hymn now extant, is that of Clement of Alexandria, in the third book of the *Pædagogus.* On the subject of primitive *Psalmody* and *Hymnology*, see J. G. Baumann *de Hymnis et Hymnopœis veteris et recentis Ecclesiæ;* J. H. Seelen *de Poesi Christiana, &c.*; J. G. Walch *de Hymnis Ecclesiæ Apostolicæ.*

9. ποιοτήτων μὲν γενῶν. The versions give *pro qualitatibus diversis rerum*, or *diversarum rerum qualitatibus.* It is somewhat difficult to ascertain what is meant; and in all probability there is some latent corruption in the text. Though

μὲν γενῶν καὶ μεταβολῶν ὡρῶν· καὶ τοῦ πάλιν ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ γενέσθαι διὰ πίστιν τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ αἰτήσεις πέμποντες,—τίς σωφρονῶν οὐχ ὁμολογήσει; τὸν διδάσκαλόν τε τούτων γενόμενον ἡμῖν, καὶ εἰς τοῦτο γεννηθέντα Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν σταυρωθέντα ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, τοῦ γενομένου ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ ἐπὶ χρόνοις Τιβερίου Καίσαρος ἐπιτρόπου, υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὄντως Θεοῦ μαθόντες καὶ ἐν δευτέρᾳ χώρᾳ ἔχοντες, πνεῦμά τε προφητικὸν ἐν τρίτῃ τάξει, ὅτι μετὰ λόγου τιμῶμεν, ἀποδείξομεν. Ἐνταῦθα γὰρ μανίαν ἡμῶν καταφαίνονται, δευτέραν χώραν μετὰ τὸν ἄτρεπτον καὶ ἀεὶ ὄντα Θεὸν καὶ γεννήτορα τῶν ἁπάντων ἀνθρώπῳ σταυρωθέντι διδόναι ἡμᾶς λέγοντες, ἀγνοοῦντες τὸ ἐν τούτῳ μυστήριον, ᾧ προσέχειν ὑμᾶς ἐξηγουμένων ἡμῶν προτρεπόμεθα.

it is obvious to suggest that ποιοτήτων has usurped the place of some derivative of ποὰ, or ποιὰ, *a herb*, it must be left to the ingenuity of a more expert conjecturer to elicit a plausible emendation.

11. αἰτήσεις. Thirlby would read αἰνέσεις, so as to include the entire period, ὑπέρ τε τοῦ γεγονέναι κ. τ. λ., within the embraces of αἰνέσεις πέμποντες. The conjecture is, at least, unnecessary.

11. τίς σωφρονῶν οὐκ ὁμολογήσει; Athenag. Legat. c. 4, τίς οὖν οὐκ ἂν ἀπορήσαι, λέγοντας Θεὸν πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν Θεὸν καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον, δεικνύντας αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ ἑνώσει δύναμιν, καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ τάξει διαίρεσιν, ἀκούσας ἀθέους καλουμένους.

15. ἐπιτρόπου. This is the proper Greek title of the Roman *procurators*, who, in the New Testament, are designated by the more general appellation ἡγεμών. See Matt. xxvii. 2, xxviii, 14; Luke xx. 20; Acts xxiii. 24, 33, xxiv. 1, 10, xxvi. 1, 30. Compare, however, 1 Pet. ii. 14. The word, as well as its Latin synonym, signifies, in its original acceptation, *a steward* or *bailiff*. Hesych. ἐπίτροπος· ὁ προστατῶν χωρίων καὶ ὅλης τῆς οὐσίας. Cic. Orat. pro Cæcin. c. 20, Procurator *dicitur omnium rerum quasi pæne dominus; hoc est, alieni juris vicarius*. In c. 34, it is less appropriately applied to *Cyrenius*, the Roman *præfect* under Herod. See Grotius on Luke ii. 2.

15. αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὄντως Θεοῦ. Thirlby proposes to read αὐτὸν τοῦ ὄντως ὄντος Θ. Bishop Kaye seems to agree in the former part of the emendation. The latter part is very improbable.

17. μετὰ λόγου. *Fortasse* μετὰ τὸν λόγον (post Logon), *præsertim cum statim sequatur*, μετὰ τὸν ἄτρεπτον κ. ἀ. ὄ. Θεόν. *Sed nihil mutamus*. OTTO.

20. ἀνθρώπῳ σταυρωθέντι. See 1 Cor. i. 18, 23. The absurdity of paying divine worship to one who had been a crucified person, was a common allegation against the early Christians. Hence the sneer of Lucian in the tract *De Morte Peregr.* c. 11, τὸν μέγαν ἐκεῖνον ἔτι σέβουσιν ἄνθρωπον, τὸν ἐν τῇ Παλαιστίνῃ ἀνασκολοπισθέντα. Thus also Celsus, ap. Origen. VII. 53, τὸν βίῳ μὲν ἐπιρρητοτάτῳ, θανάτῳ δὲ οἰκτίστῳ χρησάμενον, θεὸν τίθεσθε. And Julian, ap. Cyril. VI. p. 194, D., εἰς τοῦτο ἦλθον ὀλέθρου, ὥστε τοὺς αἰωνίους ἀφέντες θεοὺς ἐπὶ

Before he explains the doctrine of Christ crucified, Justin describes the influence of the Gospel precepts upon the life and conduct of Christians, and cautions the Emperor and his sons against the efforts and artifices of dæmons to obstruct its success.

XIV. Προλέγομεν γὰρ ὑμῖν φυλάξασθαι, μὴ οἱ προδιαβεβλημένοι ὑφ' ἡμῶν δαίμονες ἐξαπατήσωσιν ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἀποτρέψωσι τοῦ ὅλως ἐντυχεῖν καὶ συνεῖναι τὰ λεγόμενα·—ἀγωνίζονται γὰρ ἔχειν ὑμᾶς δούλους καὶ ὑπηρέτας, καὶ ποτὲ μὲν δι' ὀνείρων ἐπιφανείας, ποτὲ δ' αὖ διὰ μαγικῶν στροφῶν χειροῦνται πάντας τοὺς οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως ὑπὲρ τῆς αὐτῶν σωτηρίας ἀγωνιζομένους·—ὃν τρόπον καὶ ἡμεῖς, μετὰ τὸ τῷ λόγῳ πεισθῆναι, ἐκείνων μὲν ἀπέστημεν, Θεῷ δὲ μόνῳ τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἑπόμεθα· οἱ πάλαι μὲν πορνείαις χαίροντες, νῦν δὲ σωφροσύνην μόνην ἀσπαζόμενοι· οἱ δὲ καὶ μαγικαῖς

τῶν Ἰουδαίων μεταβῆναι νεκρόν. See also Arnob. c. Gent. I. 36; Euseb. H. E. IV. 15; Vit. Constant. III. 1; Minuc. F. Octav. c. 9; Lactant. Inst. Div. IV. 16; Chrysost. in Matt. Hom. 54; Cyril. Hier. Catech. c. 13. It will be observed that Justin now enters into a digression, returning to his subject in c. 22.

XIV. 3. συνεῖναι. Braunius, after Maranus and others, would read συνιέναι. Since, however, ἐντυχεῖν is in the aorist, why not συνεῖναι also? See Heindorf. ad Plat. Crat. p. 105; Dorvill. ad Charit. p. 485. Of these verbs the former is usually constructed with the dative, and the latter with the genitive; but both are frequently found with the accusative. As applied to books, *to meet with them;* and thence, as here, *to read;* it occurs with a *dative* in Plutarch.

8. ἐκείνων μὲν ἀπέστημεν. *We stand off from them*, i.e. *the dæmons;* having learnt, from the light of the Gospel, to detect their wiles, and resist their influence.

8. ἀγεννήτῳ. *Unbegotten.* An epithet which Justin frequently applies to God the Father; as in Apol. I. cc. 25, 49, 53; II. cc. 12, 13; Dial. Tryph. cc. 108, 126; and elsewhere. Compare Theophil. ad Autol. I. 4; Iren. Hær. IV. 75; Pseudo-Clem. Hom. X. 10; Tertull. c. Marc. I. 3, V. 1; Minuc. F. Oct. c. 23. Waterland would read ἀγένητος for ἀγέννητος, *uncreated* for *unbegotten.* See his *Works*, vol. III. p. 248, ed. Oxon.; Bp. Kaye's *Justin*, p. 56, n. 1. The import of the word, as implying an *eternal pre-existence*, appears from its use in contrast with the polytheistic notion of the *generation* of the heathen gods. Thus in the Cohort. ad Græc. c. 22, εὑρήσομεν γὰρ αὐτὸν σαφῶς καὶ φανερῶς τὸν μὲν ἀγέννητον ἀΐδιον εἶναι λέγοντα, τοὺς δὲ γεννητοὺς ἢ δημιουργητοὺς γινομένους καὶ ἀπολλυμένους.

9. οἱ πάλαι μὲν κ. τ. λ. Respecting the moral influence of Christianity on the lives of its professors, the following energetic passage is quoted by Grabe from Lactant. Inst. Div. III. 26: *Dei præcepta, quantum valeant in animis hominum, quotidiana experimenta demonstrant. Da mihi virum, qui sit iracundus, maledicus, effrænatus; paucissimis Dei verbis tam placidum quam ovem reddam. Da cupidum, avarum, tenacem; jam tibi cum liberalem dabo, et pecuniam suam plenis manibus largientem. Da timidum doloris ac mortis; jam cruces et ignes et Phalaridis taurum contemnet. Da libidinosum, adulterum, gansonem; jam sobrium, castum, continentem videbis. Da crudelem et sanguinis appetentem; jam in veram clementiam furor ille mutabitur. Da injustum, insipientem, peccatorem; continuo et æquus, et prudens, et innocens erit. Uno enim lavacro malitia omnis abolebitur. Pauca Dei præcepta sic totum hominem immutant, ut non cognoscas eundem esse.* Compare

τέχναις χρώμενοι, ἀγαθῷ καὶ ἀγεννήτῳ Θεῷ ἑαυτοὺς ἀνατεθεικότες· χρημάτων δὲ καὶ κτημάτων οἱ πόρους παντὸς μᾶλλον στέργοντες, νῦν καὶ ἃ ἔχομεν εἰς κοινὸν φέροντες, καὶ παντὶ δεομένῳ κοινωνοῦντες· οἱ μισάλληλοι δὲ καὶ ἀλληλοφόνοι, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς οὐχ ὁμοφύλους διὰ τὰ ἔθη καὶ ἑστίας κοινὰς μὴ ποιούμενοι, νῦν μετὰ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁμοδίαιτοι γινόμενοι, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν εὐχόμενοι, καὶ τοὺς ἀδίκως μισοῦντας πείθειν πειρώμενοι, ὅπως οἱ κατὰ τὰς τοῦ Χριστοῦ καλὰς ὑποθημοσύνας βιώσαντες εὐέλπιδες ὦσι σὺν ἡμῖν τῶν αὐτῶν παρὰ τοῦ πάντων δεσπόζοντος Θεοῦ τυχεῖν. Ἵνα δὲ μὴ σοφίζεσθαι ὑμᾶς δόξωμεν, ὀλίγων τινῶν τῶν παρ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ διδαγμάτων ἐπιμνησθῆναι καλῶς

Euseb. Præp. Ev. I. 4, v. 1; De Laud. Constant. c. 17; Origen. c. Cels. II. 79. See also c. 16, *infra.* Of course the inference from these effects of Christianity is its divine origin.

12. *χρημάτων καὶ κτημάτων. Money and estates.* Clem. Alex. *Quis dives salv.* c. 14. *κτήματα γάρ ἐστι κτητὰ ὄντα, καὶ χρήματα χρήσιμα ὄντα καὶ εἰς χρῆσιν ἀνθρώπων παρεσκευασμένα ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ.* See Valckn. ad Herod. v. 23.

13. *εἰς κοινὸν φέροντες κ. τ. λ.* See Acts ii. 44, 45, iv. 32, 34. Of the beneficence of the early Christians, which was extended even to Pagans, there is the most unexceptionable testimony of the apostate Julian. In his Epistle to Arsaces he writes, *τρέφουσιν οἱ Γαλιλαῖοι πρὸς τοῖς ἑαυτῶν καὶ τοὺς ἡμετέρους.* See Sozomen. H. E. v. 16.

14. *οἱ μισ. δὲ καὶ ἀλληλοφόνοι κ. τ. λ.* So again, in c. 39, *καὶ οἱ πάλαι ἀλληλοφόνται οὐ μόνον οὐ πολεμοῦμεν τοὺς ἐχθρούς, ἀλλ' ἡδέως, ὁμολογοῦντες τὸν Χριστὸν, ἀποθνήσκομεν.*

15. *καὶ ἑστίας.* Edd. Gr. Ben. Thal. Br. omit the copula, which is found in the MSS. It is, however, not only requisite, but emphatic; inasmuch as there is a marked distinction between *ἑστίας κοινὰς* and *ὁμοδίαιτοι.* The conjecture of H. Stephens, *τραπέζας καὶ ἑστίας*, is altogether useless; since *καί*, rendered *even*, gives precisely the same sense.

17. *ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν εὐχ.* This prominent Christian virtue, which stood out so nobly in contrast with the selfishness and malice of the Pagan world, is constantly adverted to by the early Fathers. Thus Tertull. ad Scap. c. 1, *Ita disciplina jubemur diligere inimicos quoque, et orare pro eis qui nos persequuntur, ut hæc sit perfecta et propria bonitas nostra, non communis. Amicos enim diligere omnium est; inimicos autem solorum Christianorum.* Cyprian. ad Demetr. c. 25, *Odiis vestris benevolentiam reddimus; et pro tormentis ac suppliciis, quæ nobis inferuntur, salutis itinera monstramus.* Lactant. Inst. Div. v. 8, *Hoc nobis credimus expedire, ut vos diligamus, et in vos ipsos, qui odistis, omnia conferamus.* Compare also Epist. ad Diognet. c. 5; Athenag. Legat. c. 11; Clem. Alex. Strom. IV.; Greg. Naz. Orat. II.; Euseb. H. E. II. 23; Chrysost. in 1 Cor. Hom. 33.

18. *οἱ κατὰ τ. τ. χ. κ. ὑ. β.* The Benedictine editor would expunge the article.

ἔχειν πρὸ τῆς ἀποδείξεως ἡγησάμεθα· καὶ ὑμέτερον ἔστω, ὡς δυνατῶν βασιλέων, ἐξετάσαι εἰ ἀληθῶς ταῦτα δεδιδάγμεθα καὶ διδάσκομεν. Βραχεῖς δὲ καὶ σύντομοι παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγοι γεγόνασιν· οὐ γὰρ σοφιστὴς ὑπῆρχεν, ἀλλὰ δύναμις Θεοῦ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ἦν.

Gospel precepts which enforce chastity;

XV. Περὶ μὲν οὖν σωφροσύνης τοσοῦτον εἶπεν· Ὃς ἂν ἐμβλέψῃ γυναικὶ πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτῆς, ἤδη ἐμοίχευσε τῇ καρδίᾳ παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ. Καὶ, Εἰ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ὁ δεξιὸς σκανδαλίζει σε, ἔκκοψον αὐτόν· συμφέρει γάρ σοι μονόφθαλμον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἢ μετὰ τῶν δύο πεμφθῆναι εἰς τὸ αἰώνιον πῦρ. Καὶ, Ὃς γαμεῖ ἀπολελυμένην ἀφ' ἑτέρου ἀνδρὸς, μοιχᾶται. Καὶ, Εἰσί τινες, οἵτινες εὐνουχίσθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, εἰσὶ δὲ οἳ ἐγεννήθησαν εὐνοῦχοι, εἰσὶ δὲ οἳ εὐνούχισαν ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν· πλὴν οὐ πάντες τοῦτο χωροῦσιν. Ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ νόμῳ ἀνθρωπίνῳ διγαμίας ποιούμε-

23. πρὸ τῆς ἀποδείξεως. *Before the explanation,* which was promised at the end of c. 13.

24. ὡς δυνατῶν βασιλέων. *Subaud.* ὄντων. H. Stephens would read ὡς δὴ συνετῶν β. The conjecture is ingenious and plausible. At the same time *sovereign power* involves the duty of such inquiries as may prevent its abuse, and secure the innocent from suffering by its unguarded exercise.

26. οὐ γὰρ σοφιστὴς κ. τ. λ. There may be an allusion to Matth. vii. 29. The expression δύναμις Θεοῦ also may probably be borrowed from 1 Cor. i. 24. Compare Rom. i. 16.

XV. 1. ὃς ἂν ἐμβλέψῃ κ. τ. λ. From Matt. v. 28. It is to be observed that, in Justin's citations from the Scriptures, and more particularly from the New Testament, there are discrepancies, chiefly verbal, which plainly indicate that he quoted from memory. At the same time, there is no difference in the statement of the facts; and the verbal coincidences are frequently so exact, that it is almost impossible to conceive them taken from any other Gospels than our own. On this interesting question, however, see Bp. Kaye's *Justin,* chap. viii. pp. 132, sqq. With regard to the citations themselves, the student will of course, if requisite, consult the Commentators.

3. εἰ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς κ. τ. λ. Compare Matt. v. 29, xviii. 9; Mark ix. 47. Justin, quoting *memoriter,* has not only confused the three passages together, but interchanged the verbs ἔκκοψον and ἔξελε. St. Matthew more appropriately applies the former to the *hand of violence,* and the latter to the *eye of concupiscence.*

6. ὃς γαμεῖ κ. τ. λ. Compare Matt. v. 32; Luke xvi. 18.

7. εἰσί τινες κ. τ. λ. See Matt. xix. 12. By an error of the press, ed. Steph. has εὐνούχησαν.

11. ὥσπερ. It has been proposed to read ὥστε, but rather understand οὕτω before καὶ in the last clause.

11. διγαμίας. Theologians have attached three meanings to the word διγαμία,

νοι, ἁμαρτωλοὶ παρὰ τῷ ἡμετέρῳ διδασκάλῳ εἰσὶ, καὶ οἱ προσβλέποντες γυναικὶ πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτῆς. Οὐ γὰρ μόνον ὁ μοιχεύων ἔργῳ ἐκβέβληται παρ' αὐτῷ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ μοιχεῦσαι βουλόμενος· ὡς οὐ τῶν ἔργων φανερῶν μόνον τῷ Θεῷ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἐνθυμημάτων. Καὶ πολλοί τινες καὶ πολλαὶ ἑξηκοντοῦται καὶ ἑβδομηκοντοῦται, οἳ ἐκ παίδων ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ, ἄφθοροι διαμένουσι· καὶ εὔχομαι

namely, *bigamia simultanea*, *bigamia successiva*, and *post divortium bigamia*. A question has arisen respecting which of the two last Justin here reprobates; but, though it will not be denied that of *second marriages*, which Athenagoras in a passage somewhat similar (Legat. c. 29) calls εὐπρεπῆ μοιχείαν, he disapproved altogether, yet he would scarcely have denounced those who contracted them, after the first union had been dissolved by death, as *sinners against the law of Christ*. See Rom. vii. 2, 3. It is clear, therefore, that he is speaking of the practice, which was sanctioned by human laws, of putting away a wife and marrying another.

13. οὐ γὰρ μόνον κ. τ. λ. This sentiment is borrowed by Irenæus (Hær. II. 32, 1), *Apud quem non solum qui mœchatur expellitur, sed et qui mœchari vult.*

15. φανερῶν. *Subaud.* ὄντων. To the same effect, Theoph. ad Autol. III. 13, οὐ μόνον διδάσκει ἡμᾶς ὁ ἅγιος λόγος τὸ μὴ ἁμαρτάνειν ἔργῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ μέχρις ἐννοίας. Iren. Hær. I. 1, *Nos propter timorem Dei etiam cogitatione peccare cavemus.*

17. οἳ ἐκ παίδων ἐμαθ. τῷ Χ. Although it does not necessarily follow that *baptism* is included in the word μαθητεύεσθαι, still it may be very reasonably inferred that some at least of these infant disciples of Christ were also baptised in their *infancy*. Nowhere indeed does Justin positively assert that infant-baptism was practised in his time; nor, on the other hand, is this the only passage in his writings from which the fact may be presumed. In Dial. Tryph. c. 43, comparing *Christian baptism* with the Jewish rite of *circumcision*, he regards the former as π ᾶ σ ι ν ἐφετὸν ὁ μ ο ί ω ς λαμβάνειν. Now it is plainly a begging of the question, to say that children are not included in the comprehensive word πᾶσιν.

18. καὶ εὔχομαι κατὰ πᾶν κ. τ. λ. *And I boast that I could display such among every race of men.* So Athenag. Legat. c. 33, εὕροις πολλοὺς τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν, καὶ ἄνδρας καὶ γυναῖκας, καταγηράσκοντας ἀγάμους. Tertull. Apol. c. 9, *Quidam multo securiores totam vim hujus erroris depellunt, senes, pueri.* See also Minuc. F. Octav. c. 31; Origen. c. Cels. I. 25. Without investigating the causes which may have combined to impress the minds of the early Christians with those notions of the superior sanctity of a single life, which at length became a principal source of profligacy and demoralization, it is an undeniable fact that such notions were most extensively prevalent, and that Justin himself held the state of *celibacy* in very high estimation. Thus he relates the story of the young man of Alexandria (c. 29) without any remark of disapprobation; and in the Treatise de Resurrectione (I. 3), if it be genuine, he even applies the epithet ἄνομον to marriage. Still it is clear that he so speaks merely in reference to an undue indulgence in sexual intercourse; for he elsewhere fully admits that marriages were necessarily contracted by Christians for the procreation of children, but apart from any impure desire, and without uniting themselves to more than a single wife.

κατὰ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων τοιούτους δεῖξαι. Τί γὰρ καὶ λέγομεν τὸ ἀναρίθμητον πλῆθος τῶν ἐξ ἀκολασίας μεταβαλόντων καὶ ταῦτα μαθόντων; Οὐ γὰρ τοὺς δικαίους, οὐδὲ τοὺς σώφρονας εἰς μετάνοιαν ἐκάλεσεν ὁ Χριστὸς, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς, καὶ ἀκολάστους, καὶ ἀδίκους. Εἶπε δὲ οὕτως· Οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους, ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλοὺς εἰς μετάνοιαν. Θέλει γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ὁ οὐράνιος τὴν μετάνοιαν τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ, ἢ τὴν κόλασιν αὐτοῦ. Περὶ δὲ τοῦ στέργειν ἅπαντας, ταῦτα ἐδίδαξεν· Εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, τί καινὸν ποιεῖτε; καὶ γὰρ οἱ πόρνοι τοῦτο ποιοῦσιν. Ἐγὼ δὲ ὑμῖν λέγω· εὔχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑμῶν, καὶ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς, καὶ εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμῖν, καὶ εὔχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς. Εἰς δὲ τὸ κοινωνεῖν τοῖς δεομένοις, καὶ μηδὲν πρὸς δόξαν ποιεῖν, ταῦτα ἔφη· Παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι δίδοτε, καὶ τὸν βουλόμενον δανείσασθαι μὴ ἀποστραφῆτε· εἰ γὰρ δανείζετε παρ' ὧν ἐλπίζετε λαβεῖν, τί καινὸν ποιεῖτε; τοῦτο καὶ οἱ τελῶναι ποιοῦσιν. Ὑμεῖς δὲ μὴ θησαυρίζητε ἑαυτοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅπου σὴς καὶ βρῶσις ἀφανίζει, καὶ λῃσταὶ διορύσσουσι· θησαυρίζετε δὲ ἑαυτοῖς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ὅπου οὔτε σὴς

[Margin: the *love of all men*, even of *enemies*; and *universal benevolence* without ostentation and hypocrisy.]

See Dial. Tryph. c. 110. For different shades of opinion on the merits of celibacy, see Herm. Past. I. 2. 2, 3, III. 9, 11; Ignat. Epist. ad Polycarp. c. 5; Clem. Alex. Strom. VI. 12, 100.

24. οὐκ ἦλθον κ. τ. λ. See Matt. ix. 13; Mark ii. 17; Luke v. 32.

25. θέλει γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ κ. τ. λ. Compare Ezek. xviii. 32, xxxiii. 11. In the construction, μᾶλλον is omitted, as frequently after the verbs βούλομαι and θέλω. See my note on Hom. Il. A. 117; Matth. Gr. Gr. §. 455, Obs. 8.

27. εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε κ. τ. λ. From Matt. v. 46; Luke vi. 32. The former Evangelist has τελῶναι, the latter ἁμαρτωλοί. Hence *Thirlby* suggests πονηροὶ for πόρνοι. Instead of τοῦτο, the same critic would prefer τὸ αὐτὸ, as in Luke vi. 33. It may be observed, however, that the loose manner in which Justin quotes the New Testament, is a bar against almost any conjectural emendation, however plausible.

28. ἐγὼ δὲ ὑμῖν λέγω κ. τ. λ. From Matt. v. 44; Luke vi. 28.

33. παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι κ. τ. λ. From Matt. v. 42; Luke vi. 30.

34. εἰ γὰρ δανείζετε κ. τ. λ. From Luke vi. 34.

36. ὑμεῖς δὲ μὴ θησαυρίζητε κ. τ. λ. From Matt. vi. 19, 20. The repetition of the last clause of this citation almost immediately is certainly suspicious, and Thirlby would remove it to the last quotation but one at the end of the chapter, where, at least, it would be more applicable. It would perhaps be better omitted altogether. Both the MSS., however, possess it, and in the same position which it holds in the text.

οὔτε βρῶσις ἀφανίζει. Τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖται ἄνθρωπος, ἂν τὸν κόσμον ὅλον κερδήσῃ, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολέσῃ; ἢ τί δώσει αὐτῆς ἀντάλλαγμα; θησαυρίζετε οὖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ὅπου οὔτε σὴς οὔτε βρῶσις ἀφανίζει. Καί, *Γίνεσθε δὲ χρηστοὶ καὶ οἰκτίρμονες, ὡς καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν χρηστός ἐστι καὶ οἰκτίρμων, καὶ τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ ἁμαρτωλοὺς καὶ δικαίους καὶ πονηρούς. Μὴ μεριμνᾶτε δὲ τί φάγητε, ἢ τί ἐνδύσησθε· οὐχ ὑμεῖς τῶν πετεινῶν καὶ τῶν θηρίων διαφέρετε; καὶ ὁ Θεὸς τρέφει αὐτά. Μὴ οὖν μεριμνήσητε τί φάγητε, ἢ τί ἐνδύσησθε· οἶδε γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος ὅτι τούτων χρείαν ἔχετε. Ζητεῖτε δὲ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ ταῦτα πάντα προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν. Ὅπου γὰρ ὁ θησαυρός ἐστιν, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ νοῦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.* Καί, *Μὴ ποιῆτε ταῦτα πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων· εἰ δὲ μή γε, μισθὸν οὐκ ἔχετε παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.*

Precepts inculcating the *patient endurance* of evil, with their results:

XVI. Περὶ δὲ τοῦ ἀνεξικάκους εἶναι, καὶ ὑπηρετικοὺς πᾶσι, καὶ ἀοργήτους, ἃ ἔφη, ταῦτά ἐστι· *Τῷ τύπτοντί σου τὴν σιαγόνα, πάρεχε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην· καὶ τὸν αἴροντά σου τὸν χιτῶνα, ἢ τὸ ἱμάτιον, μὴ κωλύσῃς. Ὃς δ' ἂν ὀργισθῇ, ἔνοχός ἐστιν εἰς τὸ πῦρ. Παντὶ δὲ ἀγγαρεύοντί σοι μίλιον, ἀκολούθησον δύο. Λαμψάτω δὲ ὑμῶν τὰ καλὰ ἔργα ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἵνα βλέποντες θαυμάζωσι τὸν*

40. *τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖται κ. τ. λ.* From Matt. xvi. 26; Luke ix. 25.

43. *γίνεσθε δὲ χρηστοὶ κ. τ. λ.* From Matt. v. 45; Luke vi. 35, 36. For *ἁμαρτωλοὺς* *Davies* would read *ἀνθρώπους*, and *Thirlby* suggests *ἐπὶ ἁμαρτωλοὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς, καὶ βρέχει ἐπὶ δ. καὶ π.* *Braunius* supposes that the single word *ὁσίους* may perhaps have been omitted. The text is thus quoted in Dial. Tryph. c. 96, *Θεὸν χρηστὸν καὶ οἰκτίρμονα ὁρῶμεν, τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλοντα ἐπὶ ἀχαρίστους καὶ δικαίους, καὶ βρέχοντα ἐπὶ ὁσίους καὶ πονηρούς.*

46. *μὴ μεριμνᾶτε κ. τ. λ.* From Matt. vi. 25, 26, 31–33; Luke xii. 22, 24, 29, 31.

52. *ὅπου γὰρ ὁ θησαυρὸς κ. τ. λ.* From Matt. vi. 21; Luke xii. 34.

53. *μὴ ποιῆτε ταῦτα κ. τ. λ.* From Matt. vi. 1.

XVI. 2. *τῷ τύπτοντι κ. τ. λ.* From Luke vi. 29. Compare Matt. v. 39, 40. In the last clause the Benedictine editor would read *αἴρ. σου τὸ ἱμάτιον, καὶ τὸν χ. μὴ κ.* And Thirlby, *αἴρ. σου τὸν χιτῶνα, καὶ τὸ ἱμ. μ. κ.*

4. *ὃς δ' ἂν ὀργισθῇ κ. τ. λ.* Compare Matt. v. 22.

5. *παντὶ δὲ ἀγγαρεύοντι κ. τ. λ.* From Matt. v. 41. For *σοι*, Thirlby proposes *σε*.

6. *λαμψάτω δὲ κ. τ. λ.* From Matt. v. 16.

πατέρα ὑμῶν τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. Οὐ γὰρ ἀνταίρειν δεῖ· οὐδὲ μιμητὰς εἶναι τῶν φαύλων βεβούληται ἡμᾶς, ἀλλὰ, διὰ τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ πραότητος, ἐξ αἰσχύνης καὶ ἐπιθυμίας τῶν κακῶν ἄγειν πάντας προετρέψατο. Ὃ γὰρ καὶ ἐπὶ πολλῶν τῶν παρ' ὑμῖν γεγενημένων ἀποδεῖξαι ἔχομεν, ἐκ βιαίων καὶ τυράννων μετέβαλον ἡττηθέντες, ἢ γειτόνων καρτερίαν βίου παρακολουθήσαντες, ἢ συνοδοιπόρων πλεονεκτουμένων ὑπομονὴν ξένην κατανοήσαντες, ἢ συμπραγματευομένων πειρασθέντες. Περὶ δὲ τοῦ μὴ ὀμνύναι ὅλως, τἀληθῆ δὲ λέγειν ἀεὶ, οὕτως παρεκελεύσατο· Μὴ ὀμόσητε ὅλως· ἔστω δὲ ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ, ναί· καὶ τὸ οὔ, οὔ· τὸ δὲ περισσὸν τούτων ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ. Ὡς δὲ καὶ τὸν Θεὸν μόνον δεῖ προσκυνεῖν, οὕτως ἔπεισεν εἰπών· Μεγίστη ἐντολή ἐστι, κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις, καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου, καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου, κύριον τὸν Θεὸν τὸν ποιήσαντά σε. Καὶ προσελθόντος αὐτῷ τινος, καὶ εἰπόντος, Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθὲ, ἀπεκρίνατο λέγων· Οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς, εἰ μὴ μόνος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ

Against *oaths:*

and denouncing an *outward* profession of Christianity, without *inward* holiness.

8. οὐ γὰρ ἀνταίρειν δεῖ. In all probability there is a reference to Matt. v. 39; and the admonition, in connexion with the following clause, will find its best comment in 1 Pet. iii. 9—16. Compare also Rom. xii. 17; 1 Thess. v. 15.

12. παρ' ὑμῖν γεγενημένων. Vulgo παρ' ἡμῖν. If this were correct, it has been very generally admitted that γεγενημένον must be adopted instead of the genitive plural; but the interchange of pronouns, which are frequently confused in the MSS., is at once the easiest and the best emendation. It was proposed by the Benedictine editor, who would also read ὅ γε καὶ in the commencement of the sentence, followed by οἳ ἐκ βιαίων κ. τ. λ. in the subsequent clause. Since, however, the reading of the copies, though somewhat abrupt, is sufficiently intelligible, it is not necessary to venture any change. Of a confusion between the pronouns ἡμεῖς and ὑμεῖς, an instance has already occurred in c. 12. See also Cohort. ad Gr. cc. 2, 9, 14, 36, 88.

13. ἢ γ. καρτερίαν βίου π. It was from observing the constancy of the Christians under persecution, that Justin himself was led to investigate the claims of their religion, and eventually to embrace it. See *Introd. Obss.* p. 3.

15. συμπραγμ. πειρασθέντες. *Having made trial* of the honesty *of those with whom they transacted business.*

17. μὴ ὀμόσητε ὅλως· κ. τ. λ. From Matt. v. 34, 37. Compare James v. 12. It has been said that Justin, by a literal interpretation of our Lord's precept, has maintained the absolute illegality of an oath among Christians. The fact is, that he has merely cited the precept itself, without any comment or observation whatever.

20. μεγίστη ἐντολὴ κ. τ. λ. From Matt. iv. 10; xxii. 37, 38; Luke x. 27.

24. προσελθόντος αὐτῷ κ. τ. λ. See Matt. xix. 16, 17; Mark x. 17, 18; Luke xviii. 18, 19.

ποιήσας τὰ πάντα. Οἳ δ' ἂν μὴ εὑρίσκωνται βιοῦντες ὡς ἐδίδαξε, γνωριζέσθωσαν μὴ ὄντες Χριστιανοὶ, κἂν λέγωσιν διὰ γλώττης τὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ διδάγματα· οὐ γὰρ τοὺς μόνον λέγοντας, ἀλλὰ τοὺς καὶ τὰ ἔργα πράττοντας, σωθήσεσθαι ἔφη. Εἶπε γὰρ οὕτως· Οὐχὶ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοι, κύριε, κύριε, εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἀλλ' ὁ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. Ὃς γὰρ ἀκούει μου, καὶ ποιεῖ ἃ λέγω, ἀκούει τοῦ ἀποστείλαντός με. Πολλοὶ δὲ ἐροῦσί μοι, Κύριε, κύριε, οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι ἐφάγομεν καὶ ἐπίομεν, καὶ δυνάμεις ἐποιήσαμεν; καὶ τότε ἐρῶ αὐτοῖς, Ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ἐργάται τῆς ἀνομίας. Τότε κλαυθμὸς ἔσται καὶ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων, ὅταν οἱ μὲν δίκαιοι λάμψωσιν ὡς ὁ ἥλιος, οἱ δὲ ἄδικοι πέμπωνται εἰς τὸ αἰώνιον πῦρ. Πολλοὶ γὰρ ἥξουσιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἔξωθεν μὲν ἐνδεδυμένοι δέρματα προβάτων, ἔσωθεν δὲ ὄντες λύκοι ἅρπαγες. Ἐκ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτούς. Πᾶν δὲ δένδρον, μὴ ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλὸν, ἐκκόπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται. Κολάζεσθαι δὲ τοὺς οὐκ ἀκολούθως τοῖς διδάγμασιν αὐτοῦ βιοῦντας, λεγομένους δὲ μόνον Χριστιανοὺς, καὶ ὑφ' ὑμῶν ἀξιοῦμεν.

XVII. Φόρους δὲ καὶ εἰσφορὰς τοῖς ὑφ' ὑμῶν τεταγμένοις πανταχοῦ πρὸ πάντων πειρώμεθα φέρειν, ὡς ἐδιδάχθημεν

Christians also scrupulously obey their Lord's injunction to *pay tribute*: and, though they do not worship, they pray for their rulers. If then, being loyal subjects, they are unjustly persecuted, Justin hints, rather than directly asserts, that eternal punishment awaits their enemies, each according to the abuse of their respective endowments, in a future state.

30. οὐχὶ πᾶς κ. τ. λ. From Matt. vii. 21.

32. ὃς γὰρ ἀκούει κ. τ. λ. Compare Matt. vii. 24; x. 40; Luke ix. 48.

34. πολλοὶ δὲ ἐροῦσι κ. τ. λ. Compare Matt. vii. 22, 23; Luke xiii. 26, 27. With reference to the latter text, *Ashton* would read οὐκ ἐνώπιόν σου ἐφάγ. καὶ ἐπίομεν, καὶ τῷ σῷ ὀν. δυν. ἐποιήσαμεν;

36. τότε κλαυθμὸς κ. τ. λ. From Matt. xiii. 42, 43. Davies proposes to read πέμψωνται. But see note on c. II. l. 21.

39. πολλοὶ γὰρ ἥξουσιν κ. τ. λ. From Matt. vii. 15, 16, 19. Thirlby suspects that the citation originally included the clause of v. 17, πᾶν δένδρον ἀγαθὸν καρποὺς καλοὺς ποιεῖ, which has been accidentally removed in copying. The former part of it, with similar variations from the original, is also adduced in the Dial. Tryph. c. 35.

43. κολάζεσθαι δὲ κ. τ. λ. Compare c. 3.

XVII. 1. φόρους καὶ εἰσφοράς. *Taxes, ordinary and extraordinary.* See Wolf's Prolegom. ad Demosth. Orat. c. Leptin. (ed. Schaefer. tom. III. p. 30). That the Christians freely acknowledged the Emperor for their earthly sovereign by the payment of taxes and a ready allegiance, is asserted in similar terms by Tatian, in his Orat. c. Græc. c. 4, προστάττει φόρους τελεῖν ὁ βασιλεύς; ἕτοιμος παρέχειν· δουλεύειν ὁ δεσπότης καὶ ὑπηρετεῖν; τὴν δουλείαν γινώσκων· τὸν μὲν γὰρ ἄνθρωπον ἀνθρωπίνως τιμητέον, φοβητέον δὲ μόνον τὸν Θεόν. And so

παρ' αὐτοῦ. Κατ' ἐκεῖνο γὰρ τοῦ καιροῦ προσελθόντες τινὲς ἠρώτων αὐτὸν, εἰ δεῖ Καίσαρι φόρους τελεῖν· καὶ ἀπεκρίνατο, Εἴπατέ μοι, τίνος εἰκόνα τὸ νόμισμα ἔχει; οἳ δὲ ἔφασαν, Καίσαρος· καὶ πάλιν ἀνταπεκρίνατο αὐτοῖς, Ἀπόδοτε οὖν τὰ Καίσαρος τῷ Καίσαρι, καὶ τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ Θεῷ. Ὅθεν Θεὸν μὲν μόνον προσκυνοῦμεν· ὑμῖν δὲ πρὸς τὰ ἄλλα χαίροντες ὑπηρετοῦμεν, βασιλεῖς καὶ ἄρχοντας ἀνθρώπων ὁμολογοῦντες, καὶ εὐχόμενοι μετὰ τῆς βασιλικῆς δυνάμεως καὶ σώφρονα τὸν λογισμὸν ἔχοντας ὑμᾶς εὑρεθῆναι. Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἡμῶν εὐχομένων καὶ πάντα εἰς φανερὸν τιθέντων ἀφροντιστήσετε, οὐδὲν ἡμεῖς βλαβησόμεθα, πιστεύοντες, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ πεπεισμένοι, κατ' ἀξίαν τῶν πράξεων ἕκαστον τίσειν διὰ πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκας, καὶ πρὸς ἀναλογίαν ὧν ἔλαβε δυνάμεων παρὰ Θεοῦ τὸν λόγον ἀπαιτηθήσεσθαι, ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐμήνυσεν, εἰπών, Ὧι πλέον ἔδωκεν ὁ Θεὸς, πλέον καὶ ἀπαιτηθήσεται παρ' αὐτοῦ.

And that the soul, when separated from the body, does exist in a future state, is consistent with the superstitions of Pagans themselves, and with the opinions of the philosophers.

XVIII. Ἀποβλέψατε γὰρ πρὸς τὸ τέλος ἑκάστου τῶν γενομένων βασιλέων, ὅτι τὸν κοινὸν πᾶσι θάνατον ἀπέθανον· ὅπερ εἰ εἰς ἀναισθησίαν ἐχώρει, ἕρμαιον ἂν ἦν τοῖς ἀδίκοις

Tertull. Apol. c. 42, *Vectigalia gratias Christianis agent, ex fide dependentibus debitum, qua alieno fraudando abstinemus.*

3. κατ' ἐκεῖνο κ. τ. λ. See Matt. xxii. 17, sqq.; Mark xii. 14, sqq.; Luke xx. 22, sqq.

7. ὅθεν Θεὸν μὲν κ. τ. λ. Tertull. Apol. c. 30, *Nos pro salute imperatorum Deum invocamus æternum, Deum verum, Deum vivum, quem et ipsi imperatores propitium sibi præter cæteros malunt. Sciunt quis illis dederit imperium; sciunt, quà homines, quis et animam; sentiunt eum Deum esse solum, in cujus solius potestate sunt, a quo sunt secundi, post quem primi, ante omnes et super omnes Deos.* And again, in c. 34, *Esto religiosus in Deum, qui vis illum propitium Imperatori. Desine alium Deum colere vel credere, atque ita et hunc deum dicere, cui deo opus est. Si non de mendacio erubescit adulatio ejusmodi, hominem deum appellans, timeat saltem de infausto.* Compare also Athenag. Legat. c. 37; Theoph. ad Autol. I. 11, III. 14; Arnob. c. Gent. IV. *fin.*; Tertull. ad. Scap. c. 2; Euseb. Hist. Eccl. VII. 11, VIII. 17, X. 8; Vit. Constant. I. 15, 17.

12. ἀφροντιστήσετε. H. Steph. supposes that Justin added, or intended to add, καὶ ἀναιρήσετε. Surely there is no very apparent reason for such addition.

17. ᾧ πλέον κ. τ. λ. From Luke xii. 48.

XVIII. 2. κοινὸν πᾶσι θάνατον ἀπ. Num. xvi. 29, LXX. εἰ κατὰ θάνατον πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἀποθανοῦνται οὗτοι.

3. ὅπερ. *Scilicet,* τὸ τὸν κοινὸν ἀποθανεῖν θάνατον. There is no necessity for ὥσπερ, the conjecture of H. Steph. Indeed the received text is preferable. With respect to the sentiment expressed, Justin seems to have had his eyes upon his favourite Plato's Phædon (vol. I. p. 243, ed. Bip.), εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἦν ὁ θάνατος

πᾶσιν. Ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ καὶ αἴσθησις πᾶσι γενομένοις μένει, καὶ κόλασις αἰωνία ἀπόκειται, μὴ ἀμελήσητε πεισθῆναί τε καὶ πιστεῦσαι, ὅτι ἀληθῆ ταῦτά ἐστι. Νεκυομαντεῖαι μὲν γάρ, καὶ αἱ ἀδιαφθόρων παίδων ἐποπτεύσεις, καὶ ψυχῶν ἀνθρωπίνων

τοῦ πάντος ἀπαλλαγή, ἕρμαιον ἂν ἦν τοῖς κακοῖς ἀποθανοῦσι, τοῦ τε σώματος ἅμα ἀπηλλάχθαι καὶ τῆς αὐτῶν κακίας μετὰ τῆς ψυχῆς. See also Dial. Tryph. c. 5.

4. πᾶσι γενομένοις. *To all who have ever lived.* So in c. 4, οἱ γενόμενοι ποιηταί. H. Steph. proposes to read ἀπογενομένοις, *to the dead.* He would also for ἐπεί, in the opening of the clause, substitute some substantive in connexion with αἴσθησις, and form the apodosis either by means of καὶ μὴ ἀμελήσητε, or μὴ ἀμελήσητε δέ. Both conjectures are equally trifling. It is manifest that καί, repeated before the two substantives αἴσθησις and κόλασις, is analogous to the Latin *et—et.*

5. ἀπόκειται. *Scil.* τοῖς ἀδίκοις.

6. νεκυομαντεῖαι μὲν γάρ, κ. τ. λ. So the MSS. The causal particle γάρ is improperly omitted in edd. Bened. and Br. Under the general term νεκυομαντεῖαι Justin includes the various *necromantic* ceremonies practised by the antients, of which he immediately subjoins two specific instances. The first of these was the slaughter of immaculate children of either sex, in order to inspect their entrails for the purpose of divination, and in the persuasion that the souls of the victims, as they passed from their bodies, communicated the knowledge of futurity demanded of them. These horrid rites were perpetrated in various places during the reign of Julian, as related in Socrat. H. E. III. 13, τηνικαῦτα καὶ οἱ Ἕλληνες τῶν χριστιανιζόντων κατέτρεχον, σύρροιά τε τῶν φιλοσοφεῖν λεγόντων ἐγίνετο, καὶ τελετάς τινας συνίστασαν, ὡς καὶ σπλαγχνοσκοπούμενοι παῖδας καταθύειν ἀφθόρους ἄρρενας καὶ θηλείας, καὶ τῶν σαρκῶν ἀπογεύεσθαι. There is also in Eusebius (H. E. VII. 10) a fragment of *Dionysius*, Bishop of Alexandria, which relates that, during the ninth persecution, the Emperor Valerian was instructed by the chief of the Egyptian magi in many impure and execrable rites; and among the rest, παῖδας ἀθλίους ἀποσφάττειν, καὶ τέκνα δυστήνων πατέρων καταθύειν, καὶ σπλάγχνα νεογενῆ διαιρεῖν. Eusebius himself also (H. E. VIII. 14) mentions it as the *crowning point* (κορωνίς) of the iniquities of the tyrant Maxentius, that he had recourse to sorcery: μαγικαῖς ἐπινοίαις τοτὲ μὲν γυναῖκας ἐγκύμονας ἀνασχίζων, τοτὲ δὲ νεογνῶν σπλάγχνα βρεφῶν διερευνώμενος. The same practice is also alleged against *Simon Magus*, who, in the *Recognitions* wrongly attributed to Clement (II. 13), makes the following declaration: *Pueri incorrupti et violenter necati animam adjuramentis ineffabilibus evocatam adsistere mihi feci; et per ipsam fit omne quod jubeo .... Statim et præscientiam habet anima, propter quod evocatur ad necromantiam.* The other mode of necromantic divination instanced by Justin was the *evocation of departed souls;* of which ψυχῶν ἀνθρωπίνων κλήσεις he has himself given as an example, in the Dial. Tryph. (c. 105), the raising of the spirit of Samuel by the Witch of Endor (1 Sam. xxviii. 7); and thence deduced, as in this place, a proof of the immortality of the soul. Thus also Lactant. Inst. Div. VII. 13, *Non auderent profecto Democritus, Epicurus, et Dicæarchus de interitu animarum mago aliquo præsente disserere, qui sciret certis carminibus cieri ab inferis animas, et adesse, et præbere se humanis oculis videndas, et loqui, et futura*

κλήσεις, καὶ οἱ λεγόμενοι παρὰ τοῖς μάγοις ὀνειροπομποὶ καὶ πάρεδροι, καὶ τὰ γινόμενα ὑπὸ τῶν ταῦτα εἰδότων πεισάτωσαν ὑμᾶς, ὅτι καὶ μετὰ θάνατον ἐν αἰσθήσει εἰσὶν αἱ ψυχαί· καὶ οἱ ψυχαῖς ἀποθανόντων λαμβανόμενοι καὶ ῥιπτούμενοι ἄνθρωποι, οὓς δαιμονιολήπτους καὶ μαινομένους καλοῦσι πάντες, καὶ τὰ παρ' ὑμῖν λεγόμενα μαντεῖα Ἀμφιλόχου καὶ Δωδώνης καὶ Πυθοῦς, καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα τοιαῦτά ἐστι, καὶ τὰ τῶν συγγραφέων διδάγματα, Ἐμπεδοκλέους

prædicere. These, and the other operations of magic which Justin has here enumerated, are also specified by Tertullian, though for a different purpose, in Apol. c. 23, *Porro magi phantasmata edunt, et jam defunctorum infamant animas; pueros in eloquium oraculi elidunt; multa miracula circulatoriis præstigiis ludunt; et somnia immittunt, habentes semel invitatorum angelorum et dæmonum assistentem sibi potestatem.* For ἀδιαφθόρων, the Cod. Reg. has διαφθόρων, with the marginal gloss: οἶμαι, αἱ ἀδιαφθόρων παίδων.

8. ὀνειροπομποὶ καὶ πάρεδροι. *Dream-senders and assistant-spirits.* Speaking of the *Simonians,* Irenæus (Hær. I. 20) says that *qui dicuntur* paredri *et* oneiropompi, *et quæcumque sunt alia perierga, apud eos studiose exercentur.* Of these *familiar spirits,* the *oneiropompi* were supposed to forward the magician's views by visiting sleepers with *prophetic dreams;* and the *paredri,* by attending upon the magi themselves, or any other persons in whose service they were appointed to minister. See Vales. ad Euseb. H. E. IV. 17.

11. καὶ οἱ ψυχαῖς κ. τ. λ. *Scil.* πεισάτωσαν ὑμᾶς.—From the Gospel narratives of the Gadarene dæmoniac (Matt. viii. 28; Mark v. 3; Luke viii. 27), it was an early opinion that the dæmons were the departed spirits of wicked men; and the same notion is advanced in Joseph. B. I. VII. 6, 3, τὰ γὰρ καλούμενα δαιμόνια πονηρῶν ἐστιν ἀνθρώπων πνεύματα, τοῖς ζῶσιν εἰσδυόμενα κ. τ. λ. Justin seems to speak in this passage as if he entertained a like idea; though in another place (Apol. II. c. 6) he clearly imagines the sufferer to be really possessed by a dæmon. On the supposition that the parting soul, falling into the dæmon's power, was compelled to do his bidding, Bp. Kaye (chap. v. p. 110) conceives that there is no real contradiction. Tatian (Orat. c. Græc. c. 17) expressly contradicts the notion that dæmons were the souls of dead men. For other opinions see Tertull. de Anim. c. 57.—It should seem also from this passage, that Justin classes *dæmoniacs* and *madmen* together.

13. μαντεῖα. Of the *Oracles* here mentioned, see *Mitford* or *Thirlwall,* and Potter's *Ant. Gr.*—In the clauses which follow, Davies suggests the following very natural transposition: καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα τοιαῦτά ἐστι, καὶ ὁ παρ' Ὀμ. βόθρος, καὶ ἡ κάθ. Ὀδ. εἰς τ. τ. ἐπίσκεψιν, καὶ τὰ τῶν συγ. δ. Ἐ. καὶ Π. Π. τε καὶ Σ. καὶ τῶν τ. α. τ. εἰπόντων.—With respect to the testimony borne by the Greek philosophers, Tertullian adduces that of Socrates in the beginning of the treatise *De Anima;* and the other three here named he classes together in c. 54, *Philosophi qui immortalitatem animæ vindicant, ut Pythagoras, ut Empedocles, vel Plato.* The reasonings of Plato on the subject will be found in the *Phædo* and *Gorgias.* See also the treatise of Augustine, *De Animæ Immortalitate.*

καὶ Πυθαγόρου, Πλατῶνός τε καὶ Σωκράτους, καὶ ὁ παρ' Ὁμήρῳ βόθρος, καὶ ἡ κάθοδος Ὀδυσσέως εἰς τὴν τούτων ἐπίσκεψιν, καὶ τῶν τὰ αὐτὰ τούτοις εἰπόντων· οἷς κἂν ὁμοίως ἡμᾶς ἀποδέξασθε, οὐχ ἧττον ἐκείνων Θεῷ πιστεύοντας ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον, οἳ καὶ τὰ νεκρούμενα καὶ εἰς γῆν βαλλόμενα πάλιν ἀπολήψεσθαι ἑαυτῶν σώματα προσδοκῶμεν, ἀδύνατον μηδὲν εἶναι Θεῷ λέγοντες.

XIX. Καὶ κατανοοῦντι τί ἀπιστότερον ἂν μᾶλλον δόξαι, ἢ εἰ ἐν σώματι μὴ ὑπήρχομεν, καί τις ἔλεγεν, ἐκ μικρᾶς τινος ῥανίδος τῆς τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου σπέρματος δυνατὸν ὀστέα τε καὶ νεῦρα καὶ σάρκας εἰκονοποιηθέντα, οἷα ὁρῶμεν, γενέσθαι; Ἔστω γὰρ νῦν ἐφ' ὑποθέσεως λεγόμενον· εἴ τις ὑμῖν, μὴ οὖσι τοιούτοις μηδὲ τοιούτων, ἔλεγε, τὸ σπέρμα τὸ

As to the resurrection of the body, it is no more incredible than its creation; so that it is absurd to risk the punishment of hell through unbelief.

16. ὁ παρ' Ὁμ. βόθρος, κ. τ. λ. The allusion is to the entire subject of the *eleventh* book of the Odyssey; upon the model of which the sixth Æneid of Virgil was manifestly framed. For the immediate reference, see Od. Λ. 25. 36, 37. Instead of εἰς τὴν τούτων ἐπίσκεψιν, Davies would read εἰς τὴν νεκύων 'πίσκεψιν, comparing Od. Λ. 93, ἤλυθες ὄφρα ἴδῃ νέκυας καὶ ἀτερπέα χῶρον.

21. πάλιν ἀπολήψεσθαι ἑαυτῶν σώματα. Compare cc. 8, 52; Dial. Tryph. cc. 69, 130.

XIX. 1. τί ἀπιστ. ἂν μᾶλλον δόξαι, ἢ κ. τ. λ. *Would any thing appear more incredible, than &c.?* The adverb μᾶλλον is frequently added to a comparative, thereby increasing the emphasis, and forming a sort of *double comparative*. Thus Herod. I. 31, ὡς ἄμεινον εἴη ἀνθρώπῳ τεθνάναι μᾶλλον ἢ ζώειν. Eur. Hec. 377, θανὼν δ' ἂν εἴη μᾶλλον εὐτυχέστερος ἢ ζῶν. Compare Hom. Il. Ω. 203; Herod. I. 32; Mark vii. 36; 2 Cor. vii. 13; Phil. i. 23. So also in Latin, Plaut. Menæch. v. 4, 22, *Magis dulcius*. See Matth. Gr. Gr. §. 458; Herm. ad Vig. p. 720; Monk ad Eur. Hipp. 487; Wetstein ad Phil. i. 23. The MSS. and most Edd. omit τί. It is, however, so essential to the sense, that there needs no hesitation in restoring it at the suggestion of Grabe and others. Thirlby, with far less probability, would read πιστότερον, and reject ἤ. Nothing is more likely than that τί should have been casually omitted, in consequence of the foregoing word ending with the same letters.

2. ἐκ μικρᾶς τινος ῥανίδος κ. τ. λ. There is an evident reference to this passage in Iren. Hær. v. 3, 2, πολλῷ δυσκολώτερον καὶ ἀπιστότερον ἦν, ἐκ μὴ ὄντων ὀστέων τε καὶ νεύρων καὶ τῆς λοιπῆς τῆς κατὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον οἰκονομίας ποιῆσαι εἰς τὸ εἶναι, καὶ ἔμψυχον καὶ λογικὸν ἀπεργάσασθαι ζῶον, ἢ τὸ γεγονὸς, ἔπειτα ἀναλυθὲν εἰς τὴν γῆν, αὖθις ἀποκαταστῆσαι, εἰς ἐκεῖνα χωρῆσαν ὅθεν τὴν ἀρχὴν μηδέπω γεγονὸς ἐγεγεγόνει ὁ ἄνθρωπος. In the Latin version of this citation the words *et venis* are inserted; whence Otto proposes to read νευρῶν καὶ σαρκῶν, so as to make the correspondence with Justin more perfect. For other references to similar arguments, advanced in the writings of the Fathers, see note on line 12.

6. μηδὲ τοιούτων. *Scil.* τέκνοις. It has been proposed to read ἐκ τοιούτων, which does not seem to be necessary.

ἀνθρώπειον δεικνὺς καὶ εἰκόνα γραπτὴν, ἐκ τοῦ τοιοῦδε οἷόν τε γενέσθαι διαβεβαιούμενος, πρὶν ἰδεῖν γενόμενον, ἐπιστεύσατε; Οὐκ ἄν τις τολμήσειεν ἀντειπεῖν. Τὸν αὐτὸν οὖν τρόπον, διὰ τὸ μήπω ἑωρακέναι ὑμᾶς ἀναστάντα νεκρὸν, ἀπιστία ἔχει. Ἀλλ' ὃν τρόπον τὴν ἀρχὴν οὐκ ἂν ἐπιστεύσατε ἐκ τῆς μικρᾶς ῥανίδος δυνατὸν τοιούτους γενέσθαι,

7. *εἰκόνα γραπτήν.* Understand *ἀνθρώπου.*

8. *οἷόν τε.* Davies suggests *τοιόνδε.*

9. *οὐκ ἄν τις τολμήσειεν ἀντ.* *No one would be hardy enough to deny* that such a statement would *surpass belief.* This is clearly the meaning, though Justin has hastily written just the reverse. Davies and Thirlby would read, though the latter is disposed to attribute the difficulty to Justin's own mistake, *οὐκ ἄν τις τολμήσειεν ἂν εἰπεῖν.*

10. *διὰ τὸ μήπω ἑωρακέναι ὑμᾶς ἀ. ν.* *Shew me,* says Autolycus to Theophilus (I. 13), *one single person who has been raised from the dead, and the sight will convince me.* There was, in fact, no Christian doctrine which the heathen treated with so much mockery and contempt, as that of the resurrection of the dead. Of this there is a remarkable instance in Acts xvii. 32. Celsus (*ap. Origen.* v. 14) speaks of it as the *hope of worms* (*σκωλήκων ἐλπίς*); and Cæcilius (*ap. Minuc. F. Oct.* c. 11), as *an old wife's tale.* Hence Tertull. ad. Nat. I. 19, *Ridete quantum libet stupidissimas mentes, quæ moriuntur ut vivant.* See also Justin's Cohort. ad Gr. c. 27; Const. Apol. v. 7; Euseb. H. E. v. 1; Lactant. Inst. Div. VII. 26.

12. *ἐκ τῆς μικρᾶς ῥανίδος κ. τ. λ.* The incredulity of the heathen concerning the resurrection of the body called the attention of Christian writers frequently to the subject; and a standing argument with them was the analogy which it manifestly bore to the creation of the first man, and the generation of his posterity. They vary, indeed, in their mode of drawing the parallel; but the inference is still the same. The argument, as stated by Justin, is found also in Theoph. ad Autol. I. 8, *Ἀλλὰ ἀπιστεῖς νεκροὺς ἐγείρεσθαι; ὅτε ἔσται, τότε πιστεύσεις θέλων καὶ μὴ θέλων· καὶ ἡ πίστις σου εἰς ἀπιστίαν λογισθήσεται, ἐὰν μὴ νῦν πιστεύσῃς.—Εἰ οὖν γεωργὸς πιστεύει τῇ γῇ, καὶ ὁ πλέων τῷ πλοίῳ, καὶ ὁ κάμνων τῷ ἰάτρῳ, σὺ οὐ βούλει σεαυτὸν πιστεῦσαι τῷ Θεῷ, τοσούτους ἀῤῥαβῶνας ἔχων παρ' αὐτοῦ; Πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ὅτι ἐποίησέ σε ἐξ οὐκ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι· εἰ γὰρ ὁ πατήρ σου οὐκ ἦν, οὐδὲ ἡ μητὴρ, πολὺ μᾶλλον οὐδὲ σὺ ἦς ποτε· καὶ ἔπλασέ σε ἐξ ὑγρᾶς οὐσίας μικρᾶς καὶ ἐλαχίστης ῥανίδος, ἥτις οὐδὲ αὐτὴ ἦν ποτε.* So Constit. Apost. v. 43, 7, *ὁ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ τὸ σῶμα ἐκ γῆς ποιήσας καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν καὶ τοῦ πρώτου μετὰ διάλυσιν τὸ σῶμα ἀναστήσει,—ὁ ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκ μικροῦ σπέρματος μορφῶν, καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῷ οὐκ οὖσαν ἐνδημιούργων.* Theodorit. Epitom. D. D. *Quemadmodum ab initio glebam illam facillime in corpus mutavit, ac multa variaque fecit membra rerum omnium conditor Deus, itidem proclive ei est, ex paucis hisce reliquiis corporis instaurare substantiam. Hoc enim nunc etiam juxta veterem creationem in utero fieri cernimus. Nam ex modicæ materiæ semine ossa fiunt, et pelliculæ, et nervi, et venæ, et arteriæ, et cutis, et pinguedo, et carnes, et reliqua omnia unde corpus consistit. Extremæ igitur dementiæ est non ea quæ videntur credere, præsertim Dei promissionibus accedentibus.* To the same effect, though not precisely in the same form, is the reasoning of

καὶ ὁρᾶτε γινομένους· τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον λογίσασθε, ὅτι διαλυθέντα, καὶ δίκην σπερμάτων εἰς γῆν ἀναλυθέντα, τὰ ἀνθρώπεια σώματα κατὰ καιρὸν προστάξει Θεοῦ ἀναστῆναι καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν ἐνδύσασθαι, οὐκ ἀδύνατον. Ποίαν *γὰρ ἀξίαν* Θεοῦ *δύναμιν λέγουσιν οἱ φάσκοντες εἰς ἐκεῖνο χωρεῖν ἕκαστον ἐξ οὗπερ ἐγένετο, καὶ παρὰ ταῦτα μηδὲν ἄλλο δύνασθαι μηδὲ τὸν* Θεὸν, *οὐκ ἔχομεν λέγειν· ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνο συνορῶμεν, ὅτι οὐκ ἂν ἐπίστευσαν δυνατὸν εἶναι τοιούτους ποτὲ γενέσθαι, ὁποίους καὶ ἑαυτοὺς καὶ τὸν σύμπαντα κόσμον, καὶ ἐξ ὁποίων γεγενημένα ὁρῶσι.* Κρεῖττον *δὲ πιστεύειν καὶ τὰ τῇ ἑαυτῶν φύσει καὶ ἀνθρώποις ἀδύνατα, ἢ ὁμοίως τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀπιστεῖν, προειλήφαμεν· ἐπειδὴ καὶ τὸν ἡμέτερον διδάσκαλον* Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν *ἔγνωμεν εἰπόντα,* Τὰ *ἀδύνατα παρὰ ἀνθρώποις δυνατὰ παρὰ* Θεῷ· *καί,* Μὴ *φοβεῖσθε τοὺς ἀναιροῦντας ὑμᾶς, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μὴ δυναμένους τι ποιῆσαι, εἶπε, φοβήθητε δὲ τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν δυνάμενον καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα εἰς γέενναν ἐμβαλεῖν.* Ἡ *δὲ*

Tatian in Orat. c. Græc. c. 6, *ὥσπερ οὐκ ὢν πρὶν ἢ γένεσθαι, τίς ἤμην οὐκ ἐγίνωσκον, μόνον δὲ ἐν ὑποστάσει τῆς σαρκικῆς ὕλης ὑπῆρχον, γεγονὼς δὲ ὁ μὴ πάλαι, διὰ τῆς γενέσεως τὸ εἶναι πεπίστευκα· τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ὁ γενόμενος, καὶ διὰ θανάτου μηκέτι ὢν αὖθίς τε μηκέθ' ὁρώμενος, ἔσομαι πάλιν, ὥσπερ μὴ πάλαι γεγονὼς εἶτα γεννηθείς.* Tertull. de Resurr. Carn. c. 11, *Idoneus est reficere, qui fecit; quanto plus est fecisse quam refecisse, initium dedisse quam reddidisse. Ita restitutionem carnis faciliorem credas institutione.* Minuc. F. Oct. c. 34, *Quis tam stultus aut brutus sit ut audeat repugnare, hominem a Deo, ut primum potuit fingi, ita posse denuo reformari? Sicut de nihilo nasci licuit, ita de nihilo licere reparari? Porro difficilius est id quod non sit incipere, quam id quod fuerit iterare.* Prudent. adv. Symmach. II. 196, *Qui potui formare novum, reparabo peremptum.* Compare also Justin de Resurr. Carn. c. 5; Athenag. de Resurr. Mort. c. 3; Tertull. Apol. c. 48; Lactant. Inst. Div. VII. 23; Hilar. En. in Ps. LXIII.; Cyril. c. Julian. I. 7; August. Civ. D. XXII. 14.

14. *εἰς γῆν ἀναλυθέντα.* So Cod. Clar. *in margine. Vulgo, διαλυθέντα, ut paulo supra.* To avoid the tautology, Grabe suggests *διαλαθέντα*; Davies and Braunius, *διαχυθέντα.* The reading of Thirlby, which Otto has admitted into the text, is amply confirmed by the passage of Irenæus quoted above at line 2. So also Iren. Hær. v. 2, 3, *τὴν εἰς τὴν γῆν ἡμῶν ἀνάλυσιν.*

18. *παρὰ ταῦτα μηδὲν ἄλλο δ. μ. τ. Θεον.* Such was clearly the opinion, though he has endeavoured to express it in a modified form, of Celsus (*ap. Origen.* v. 14): *οὐδὲν ἔχοντες ἀποκρίνασθαι, καταφεύγουσιν εἰς ἀτοπωτάτην ἀναχώρησιν, ὅτι πᾶν δύνατον τῷ Θεῷ· ἀλλ' οὔτι γε τὰ αἰσχρὰ ὁ Θεὸς δύναται, οὐδὲ τὰ παρὰ φύσιν βούλεται.*

26. *τὰ ἀδύνατα κ. τ. λ.* From Luke xviii. 27.

26. *μὴ φοβεῖσθε κ. τ. λ.* Compare Matt. x. 28; Luke xii. 4, 5.

γέεννά ἐστι τόπος, ἔνθα κολάζεσθαι μέλλουσιν οἱ ἀδίκως βιώσαντες, καὶ μὴ πιστεύοντες ταῦτα γενήσεσθαι, ὅσα ὁ Θεὸς διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐδίδαξεν.

In the opinion that the world will be destroyed by fire, that the just and the unjust will be respectively rewarded and punished after death, and on other subjects, the Christians think in some measure with the heathens, though their views are more correct and more sublime. It is therefore unreasonable that the former should be persecuted, and the latter honoured.

XX. Καὶ Σίβυλλα δὲ καὶ Ὑστάσπης γενήσεσθαι τῶν φθαρτῶν ἀνάλωσιν διὰ πυρὸς ἔφασαν. Οἱ λεγόμενοι δὲ Στωϊκοὶ φιλόσοφοι καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν Θεὸν εἰς πῦρ ἀναλύεσθαι δογματίζουσι, καὶ αὖ πάλιν κατὰ μεταβολὴν τὸν κόσμον γενέσθαι λέγουσιν· ἡμεῖς δὲ κρεῖττόν τι τῶν μεταβαλλομένων νοοῦμεν τῶν πάντων ποιητὴν Θεόν. Εἰ οὖν καὶ ὁμοίως

30. γέεννα. See the Commentators on Matt. v. 22.

XX. 1. Σίβυλλα καὶ Ὑστάσπης. The prophecy of the Sibyl, to which Justin appears to allude, is still extant in the Orac. Sibyllin. iv. 171, ῥεύσει δὲ πυρὸς μαλεροῦ καταράκτης Ἀκάματος· φλέξει δὲ γαῖαν, φλέξει δὲ θάλασσαν, Καὶ πόλον οὐράνιον, καὶ ἤματα· καὶ κτίσιν αὐτὴν Εἰς ἓν χωνεύσει, καὶ εἰς καθαρὸν διαλέξει. In the Quæst. et Resp. ad Orthodoxos (c. 74), the author, who has been wrongly identified with Justin, speaks of Clement of Rome as quoting the same prediction of the Sibyl in his Epistle to the Corinthians; but in the Epistle, as it now exists, there is no such quotation. As to the tradition itself, that the world will be destroyed by fire, it is copiously illustrated by Grotius (de Verit. Rel. Chr. i. 22). Of the *Sibylline Oracles*, which are now generally regarded as a forgery of the early ages of Christianity, or rather perhaps as heathen fragments interpolated partly by Alexandrian Jews and partly by Christians, see Prideaux's *Connexion*, Part ii. B. 9; Jortin's *Remarks on Eccl. Hist.* vol. i. pp. 283, sqq.; and Birger *de libris Sibyllistarum Vet. Eccles.* From their frequent appeal to these verses, the Christians were reproachfully termed *Sibyllists*. See Origen. c. Cels. v. 61. They appealed also, though not so commonly, to the prophecies of Hystaspes; of whom see Agath. Byz. Hist. ii. 24; Ammian. Marcell. xxiii. 6, and Vales. not. *ad loc.* Lactant. Inst. Div. vii. 15, 18. There is a passage in the *Stromata* of Clemens Alex. (vi. 6, 43), wherein he mentions an apocryphal work, entitled *Prædicatio Petri*, as containing a discourse of St. Paul, in which there was a combined appeal, as in this passage of Justin, to the *Sibyl* and *Hystaspes*. Be it observed, in conclusion, that the reading of the text is confirmed, not only by the above reference, but by the occurrence of the genitive Ὑστάσπου in c. 44, *infra*. The common reading is Ὑστασπις.

3. Στωϊκοὶ φιλόσοφοι. See Cic. de Nat. Deor. ii. 46. So again in Apol. ii. c. 7, οὕτω γὰρ ἡμεῖς τὴν ἐκπύρωσίν φαμεν γενήσεσθαι, ἀλλ' οὐκ ὡς Στωϊκοὶ κ. τ. λ. See also Tatian. Orat. c. Gr. c. 14. From what Justin says below (c. 57) of an ἐκπύρωσις ἐπὶ κολάσει τῶν ἀσεβῶν, it should seem that he identified this final conflagration with the fire of hell.

6. εἰ οὖν καὶ ὁμοίως κ. τ. λ. So again c. 24, τὰ ὅμοια τοῖς Ἕλλησι λέγοντες, μόνοι μισούμεθα δι' ὄνομα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Thus also Tertull. Apol. c. 46, *Eadem et Philosophi monent et profitentur. Cur ergo quibus comparamur de disciplina, proinde illis non adæquamur ad licentiam impunitatemque disciplinæ?* Theophilus (*ad Autol.* ii. 37, 38), and Clemens Alex. (*Strom.* iv), have produced a variety of passages from the heathen poets and philosophers, which bear a certain resemblance

τινὰ τοῖς παρ' ὑμῖν τιμωμένοις ποιηταῖς καὶ φιλοσόφοις λέγομεν, ἔνια δὲ καὶ μειζόνως καὶ θείως, καὶ μόνοι μετὰ ἀποδείξεως, τί παρὰ πάντας ἀδίκως μισούμεθα; Τῷ γὰρ λέγειν ἡμᾶς, ὑπὸ Θεοῦ πάντα κεκοσμῆσθαι καὶ γεγενῆσθαι, Πλάτωνος δόξομεν λέγειν δόγμα· τῷ δὲ, ἐκπύρωσιν γενέσθαι, Στωϊκῶν· τῷ δὲ, κολάζεσθαι ἐν αἰσθήσει καὶ μετὰ θάνατον οὔσας τὰς τῶν ἀδίκων ψυχὰς, τὰς δὲ τῶν σπουδαίων ἀπηλλαγμένας τῶν τιμωριῶν εὖ διάγειν, ποιηταῖς καὶ φιλοσόφοις τὰ αὐτὰ λέγειν δόξομεν· τῷ δὲ καὶ, μὴ δεῖν χειρῶν, ἔργοις ἀνθρώπους προσκυνεῖν, Μενάνδρῳ τῷ κωμικῷ, καὶ τοῖς ταῦτα φήσασι ταὐτὰ φράζομεν· μείζονα γὰρ τὸν δημιουργὸν τοῦ σκευαζομένου ἀπεφήναντο.

to the tenets of Christianity. At the same time, Justin continually maintains the infinite superiority of the Christian system above the most exalted discoveries of the human mind. Thus again in Apol. II. 13, *οὐχ ὅτι ἀλλότριά ἐστι τὰ Πλάτωνος διδάγματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀλλ' ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι πάντη ὅμοια, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων, Στωϊκῶν τε, καὶ ποιητῶν, καὶ συγγραφέων.* Compare also Apol. I. cc. 8, 44; II. c. 8; Cohort. ad Gr. cc. 1, 14; Tertull. de Anim. c. 2; Lactant. Inst. Div. III. 18, 20; VI. 24.

8. *θείως.* There is no necessity, as Grabe admits, to read *θειοτέρως* with Sylburg and others.

11. *Πλάτωνος.* Grabe adduces the following testimony to the same effect from the Treatise of Hierocles *de Providentia et Fato*:—*κατὰ Πλάτωνα Θεὸν αὐτὸν προϋφίστησιν ἡ σκέψις πάσης ἐμφανοῦς τε καὶ ἀφανοῦς διακοσμήσεως δημιουργὸν, ὃν ἐκ μηδενὸς ὑποκειμένου προαγαγεῖν τὸν τεχνίτην· ἀρκεῖν γὰρ αὐτῷ εἰς ὑπόστασιν τῶν ὄντων τὸ οἰκεῖον βούλημα.* Similar notices of the Platonic doctrine of creation occur frequently in the early Christian writers.

14. *ποιηταῖς καὶ φιλοσόφοις.* See the references in the note on line 6.

15. *χειρῶν ἔργοις ἀνθρώπους.* For the vulgar reading *χειρῶν ἀνθρώποις*, which is obviously corrupt, Braunius would adopt the easy and elegant emendation of Sylburg, *χειρῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἔργοις.* At the same time, the reading of Stephens, which has received the approbation of *Grabe*, *Thalemann*, and *Otto*, is not only nearer to that of the copies, but amply confirmed by the very similar form in c. 53, *ἔθνη χειρῶν ἔργοις λατρεύοντα.* It has accordingly been received into the text. Other conjectures have been offered, which it is needless to mention particularly. Of the verb *προσκυνεῖν*, and its government, see Lobeck. ad Phryn. p. 463, and the commentators on Matt. ii. 2.

16. *Μενάνδρῳ τῷ κωμικῷ κ. τ. λ.* Sentiments to this effect will be found among the citations from Menander, adduced by Justin himself in his Treatise *de Monarch.* c. 5. Thus in Fragm. Hier. v. 2, *εἰ γὰρ ἕλκει τινα (τὸν?) θεὸν Τοῖς κυμβάλοις ἀνθρώπος εἰς ὃ βούλεται, Ὁ τοῦτο ποιῶν ἐστὶ μείζων τοῦ θεοῦ. Ἀλλ' ἔστι τόλμης κ. τ. λ.* Again, in Fr. Diphil. v. 1, *τὸν ὄντα κύριον πάντων ἀεὶ Καὶ πατέρα τοῦτον διὰ τέλους τιμᾶν μόνον, Ἀγαθῶν τοσούτων εὑρετὴν καὶ κτίστορα.*

The Christian doctrines, and, first, the *Ascension of Christ*, are far more credible than the absurdities of the Pagan Mythology; more especially if the vices of their gods and deified heroes are taken into the account.

XXI. Τῷ δὲ καὶ τὸν λόγον, ὅ ἐστι πρῶτον γέννημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἄνευ ἐπιμιξίας φάσκειν ἡμᾶς γεγενῆσθαι, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν διδάσκαλον ἡμῶν, καὶ τοῦτον σταυρωθέντα, καὶ ἀποθανόντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα ἀνεληλυθέναι εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, οὐ παρὰ τοὺς παρ' ὑμῖν λεγομένους υἱοὺς τῷ Διῒ καινόν τι φέρομεν. Πόσους γὰρ υἱοὺς φάσκουσι τοῦ Διὸς οἱ παρ' ὑμῖν τιμώμενοι συγγραφεῖς, ἐπίστασθε· Ἑρμῆν μὲν, λόγον τὸν ἑρμηνευτικὸν καὶ πάντων διδάσκαλον· Ἀσκληπιὸν δὲ, καὶ θεραπευτὴν γενόμενον, κεραυνωθέντα ἀνεληλυθέναι εἰς οὐρανόν· Διόνυσον δὲ διασπαραχθέντα· Ἡρακλέα δὲ φυγῇ πόνων ἑαυτὸν πυρὶ δόντα· τοὺς ἐκ Λήδας δὲ Διοσκούρους, καὶ τὸν ἐκ Δανάης Περσέα· καὶ τὸν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων δὲ ἐφ' ἵππου Πηγάσου Βελλεροφόντην. Τί γὰρ λέγομεν τὴν

XXI. 2. γεγενῆσθαι. This verb, as well as the substantive γένεσις, is equally applied by Justin to the eternal generation of Christ from the Father; and, as in this place, to his *birth* from the Virgin Mary. Compare c. 22 infra; and see Bishop Kaye's Justin, p. 64. Thirlby, it should be observed, reads γεγεννῆσθαι. The change however, if made in one instance, must be made in all; and this would be scarcely justifiable.

5. οὐ καινόν τι φέρομεν. So Tatian. Orat. Græc. c. 21: Οὐ μωραίνομεν, ἄνδρες Ἕλληνες, οὐδὲ λήρους ἀπαγγέλλομεν, Θεὸν ἐν ἀνθρώπου μορφῇ γεγονέναι καταγγέλλοντες. Οἱ λοιδοροῦντες ἡμᾶς συγκρίνατε τοὺς μύθους ὑμῶν τοῖς ἡμετέροις διηγήμασι. Ἀποβλέψαντες πρὸς τὰ οἰκεῖα ἀπομνημονεύματα, κἂν ὁμοίως μυθολογοῦντας ἀποδέξασθε. See also Tertull. Apol. c. 46, cited above at c. 20, l. 6. It was indeed a constant charge against the Christians, and a ground for their persecution, that they had introduced ξένην τινα καὶ καινὴν θρησκείαν. See Euseb. H. E. I. 2. v. 1; Præp. Ev. I. 5; Theoph. ad Autol. III. 1; Arnob. c. Gent. II. 66; Origen. c. Cels. I. 26. Hence it was that not only Justin, but the other Christian writers, were zealous in repelling, and not always with the best arguments, this accusation of novel doctrine. In addition to the passage above quoted, compare Tatian. Orat. c. Gr. cc. 31, 36 sqq.; Theoph. ad Autol. II. 30; III. 20; Clem. Alex. Strom. I. 15, 72; 21, 101; Lactant. Inst. Div. IV. 5; Euseb. Pr. Ev. X. 9; Cyril. adv. Julian. I. 1.

7. λόγον τὸν ἑρμηνευτικόν. Compare Carm. Orph. XXVII. 4; Hor. Od. I. 10, 1—3; Porphyr. ap. Euseb. Pr. Evang. III. A similar enumeration of the sons of Jupiter is given also in Theophil. ad Autol. I. 10, τί μοι τὸ λοιπὸν καταλέγειν περὶ τῶν υἱῶν; Ἡρακλέα μὲν ἑαυτὸν καύσαντα· Διόνυσον δὲ μεθύοντα καὶ μαινόμενον κ. τ. λ. See also c. 54, *infra*. Of these, and other such personages, it must suffice, for the most part, to refer to the *Mythologies*.

9. καί. For καίπερ. The medical skill of *Æsculapius* was the cause of his destruction. It is scarcely necessary to observe that the infinitive ἀνεληλυθέναι depends upon ἐπίστασθε, and is to be repeated throughout.

13. ἐφ' ἵππου. *Vulgo* ὑφ' ἵππου. The emendation, suggested by Braunius and others, is abundantly confirmed by Justin himself, in a reference to this place

Ἀριάδνην, καὶ τοὺς ὁμοίους αὐτῇ κατηστερίσθαι λεγομένους; καὶ τί γὰρ τοὺς ἀποθνήσκοντας παρ' ὑμῖν αὐτοκράτορας ἀεὶ ἀπαθανατίζεσθαι ἀξιοῦντες, καὶ ὀμνύντα τινὰ προάγετε ἑωρακέναι ἐκ τῆς πυρᾶς ἀνερχόμενον εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν τὸν κατακαέντα Καίσαρα; Καὶ ὁποῖαι ἑκάστου τῶν λεγομένων υἱῶν τοῦ Διὸς ἱστοροῦνται αἱ πράξεις, πρὸς εἰδότας λέγειν οὐκ ἀνάγκη, πλὴν ὅτι εἰς διαφορὰν καὶ προτροπὴν τῶν

in c. 54. It has been thought that ἀνηρπασμένον, or ἀφανισθέντα, or some like word, is understood: but see the last note, and compare the parallel passage. Bellerophon however, according to the fable, did not succeed in this attempt to reach heaven on the back of Pegasus. See Pind. Isth. VII. 63 sqq.; Hor. Od. IV. 11, 26 sqq. With ἐξ ἀνθρώπων supply γεγενημένον. The words are plainly added to mark the distinction between Bellerophon of mortal birth, and the sons of Jupiter.

14. ὁμοίους. *Fortasse* ὁμοίως. THIRLBY. The conversion of men into *constellations*, and the *apotheoses* of the Roman emperors are, in like manner, severely censured in Tatian. Orat. c. Græc. c. 10.

15. αὐτοκράτορας ἀεὶ ἀπ. ἀξιοῦντες. Either ἐστε is understood, or, what is more probable, there is a corruption in the text, which the insertion of οὓς after αὐτοκράτορας, as suggested by Thirlby, will not altogether remove. It will be necessary to read ἀξιοῦτε also; or else to erase καὶ before ὀμνύντα. In the beginning of the sentence, the Benedictine editor would prefer καὶ τοί. The received text is, however, far preferable; which requires the subaudition of λέγομεν from the preceding clause. As to these *Apotheoses*, Grabe cites a passage on the subject from Athanas. *adv. Gentes*:—Ῥωμαίων σύγκλητος τοὺς πώποτε αὐτῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἄρξαντας βασιλέας, ἢ πάντας, ἢ οὓς ἂν αὐτοὶ βούλονται καὶ κρίνουσι, δογματίζουσιν ἐν θεοῖς εἶναι, καὶ θρησκεύεσθαι θεοὺς γράφουσιν.

16. ὀμνύντα τινὰ προάγετε κ. τ. λ. The accuracy of Justin has here been questioned, on the plea that, in lieu of the perjury which attested the apotheosis of *Romulus* and *Julius Cæsar*, an eagle, let loose from the funeral pile of the later emperors, was supposed to convey the soul of the deceased to heaven. It should seem, however, that latterly both impositions were practised. Thus Sueton. V. Aug. in fine:—*Non defuit vir prætorius, qui se effigiem cremati euntem in cœlum vidisse juravit.* Justin's account is confirmed by Tatian, in Orat. c. Græc. c. 10. See also Tertull. ad Nat. I. 10, II. 7.

20. διαφορὰν καὶ προτροπήν. *Advantage and encouragement.* Justin is clearly speaking ironically, in a sense precisely the reverse of his real meaning. At the same time sarcasm is here somewhat out of place; nor are the nouns employed of very common occurrence. Of the former indeed it would be difficult to find a parallel usage; and even προτροπὴ is rather supported by the corresponding sense of the verb προτρέπειν, than by its own appearance once or twice in Plato. Compare, however, cc. 13, 22; Herod. I. 31; IX. 90; Soph. Ant. 270; Xen. Mem. I. 4, 13; IV. 5, 1. Upon the whole, therefore, the elegant and pertinent emendation διαφθορὰν καὶ παρατροπήν, *corruption and perversion*, which has received the sanction of the generality of critics, is not to be lightly set aside by the dissent of *Braunius* and *Otto*.

ἐκπαιδευομένων ταῦτα γέγραπται· μιμητὰς γὰρ θεῶν καλὸν εἶναι πάντες ἡγοῦνται. Ἀπείη δὲ σωφρονούσης ψυχῆς ἔννοια τοιαύτη περὶ θεῶν, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν ἡγεμόνα καὶ γεννήτορα πάντων κατ' αὐτοὺς Δία πατροφόντην τε καὶ πατρὸς τοιούτου γεγονέναι, ἔρωτί τε κακῶν καὶ αἰσχρῶν ἡδονῶν ἥττω γενόμενον ἐπὶ Γανυμήδην καὶ τὰς πολλὰς μοιχευθείσας γυναῖκας ἐλθεῖν, καὶ τοὺς αὐτοῦ παῖδας τὰ ὅμοια πράξαντας παραδέξασθαι. Ἀλλ', ὡς προέφημεν, οἱ φαῦλοι δαίμονες ταῦτα ἔπραξαν. Ἀπαθανατίζεσθαι δὲ ἡμεῖς μόνους δεδιδάγμεθα τοὺς ὁσίως καὶ ἐναρέτως ἐγγὺς Θεῷ βιοῦντας· κολάζεσθαι δὲ τοὺς ἀδίκως καὶ μὴ μεταβάλλοντας ἐν αἰωνίῳ πυρὶ πιστεύομεν.

The like may be said of the *Generation, Incarnation, Death*, and *Miracles* of Christ.

XXII. Υἱὸς δὲ Θεοῦ ὁ Ἰησοῦς λεγόμενος, εἰ καὶ κοινῶς μόνον ἄνθρωπος, διὰ σοφίαν ἄξιος υἱὸς Θεοῦ λέγεσθαι· πατέρα γὰρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε πάντες συγγραφεῖς τὸν Θεὸν καλοῦσιν. Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἰδίως παρὰ τὴν κοινὴν γένεσιν γεγενῆσθαι αὐτὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ λέγομεν λόγον Θεοῦ, ὡς προέφημεν, κοινὸν τοῦτο ἔστω ὑμῖν τοῖς τὸν Ἑρμῆν λόγον τὸν παρὰ Θεοῦ ἀγγελτικὸν λέγουσιν. Εἰ δὲ αἰτιάσαιτό τις

21. *ταῦτα.* The fabulous histories of the gods.

24. *πατροφόντην.* Mythology does not represent Jupiter as a *parricide* in the strict sense of the term. He dethroned, and is said by some to have imprisoned, his father; but to have slain an immortal would surely have been somewhat of an impossibility. With the same limitation, *πατρὸς τοιούτου* must be applied to Saturn; whose father, *Uranus*, received from him much the same treatment that he afterward met with in his turn from Jupiter.

31. *ἀδικῶς.* Repeat *βιοῦντας* from the preceding clause. It is altogether needless to read *ἀδίκους.*

XXII. 1. *κοινῶς.* Dial. Tryph. c. 99, *ὡς κοινὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐν Ἅιδου μένειν.* Clem. Alex. Strom. III., *ἔπειτα δὲ οὐκ ἄνθρωπος ἦν κοινός.* Cf. Euseb. H. E. I. 2, III. 27, VII. 27. Hence Thirlby and Davies would read *κοινὸς* in this passage; but the cases are entirely different. The adverb is here manifestly opposed, as Braunius justly remarks, to *ἰδίως* in the next sentence; and the *ordinary* nature of man to the *peculiar* generation of Christ.

3. *πατέρα ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε.* See Homer *passim;* and compare Justin's Cohort. ad Græc. c. 2. The argument is that Jesus, merely as a remarkable man, would be justly regarded as the son of that God, whom heathen writers generally represented as the *Father of gods and men;* and that in a higher sense, considered as the *Word of God*, begotten in a manner different from the ordinary mode of generation, the Christian doctrine respecting him bears some analogy to the Pagan notions respecting Mercury, in his character of *λόγος ὁ παρὰ θεοῦ ἀγγελτικός.* Compare Dial. Tryph. cc. 16, 128.

ἐσταυρῶσθαι αὐτὸν, καὶ τοῦτο κοινὸν τοῖς προκατηριθμημένοις παθοῦσιν υἱοῖς καθ' ὑμᾶς τοῦ Διὸς ὑπάρχει. Ἐκείνων τε γὰρ οὐχ ὅμοια τὰ πάθη τοῦ θανάτου, ἀλλὰ διάφορα ἱστορεῖται· ὥστε μηδὲ τὸ ἴδιον τοῦ πάθους ἧττονα δοκεῖν εἶναι τοῦτον, ἀλλ', ὡς ὑπεσχόμεθα, προϊόντος τοῦ λόγου καὶ κρείττονα ἀποδείξομεν, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἀποδέδεικται· ὁ γὰρ κρείττων ἐκ τῶν πράξεων φαίνεται. Εἰ δὲ καὶ διὰ παρθένου γεγεννῆσθαι φέρομεν, κοινὸν καὶ τοῦτο πρὸς τὸν Περσέα ἔστω ὑμῖν. Ὧι δὲ λέγομεν χωλοὺς, καὶ παραλυτικοὺς, καὶ ἐκ γενετῆς πηροὺς ὑγιεῖς πεποιηκέναι αὐτὸν, καὶ νεκροὺς ἀνεγεῖραι, ὅμοια τοῖς ὑπὸ Ἀσκληπιοῦ γεγενῆσθαι λεγομένοις καὶ ταὐτὰ φάσκειν δόξομεν.

XXIII. Ἵνα δὲ ἤδη καὶ τοῦτο φανερὸν ὑμῖν γένηται, ὅτι ὁπόσα λέγομεν μαθόντες παρὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῶν προελθόντων αὐτοῦ προφητῶν, μόνα ἀληθῆ ἐστι καὶ πρεσβύτερα πάντων τῶν γεγενημένων συγγραφέων, καὶ οὐχὶ διὰ τὸ ταὐτὰ λέγειν αὐτοῖς παραδεχθῆναι ἀξιοῦμεν, ἀλλ' ὅτι τὸ

In entering upon the second division of the Apology, Justin lays down three propositions which he designs to establish.

8. ἐσταυρῶσθαι αὐτόν. See above, on c. 18, l. 20.

11. τὸ ἴδιον τοῦ πάθους. For τὸ ἴδιον πάθος. Supply κατά. Would τὸ ἴδιον αὐτοῦ πάθος be a better reading? For μηδὲ Pearson conjectures μὴ διά.

13. ἀποδείξομεν. See below, cc. 35, 55.

— ὁ γὰρ κρείττων κ. τ. λ. Hence Iren. Hær. II. 30, 5, *Qui enim melior est, ex operibus ostenditur.*

14. διὰ παρθένου. This expression has been thought to savour of Valentinianism. Suffice it to say that Christ is said by Justin γεγενῆσθαι ἐκ παρθένου, διὰ παρθένου, and ἀπὸ παρθένου, indifferently.

17. ἐκ γενετῆς πηρούς. *Those blind from their birth. Vulgo,* πονηρούς. The text is emended on the authority of Sylburg, Grabe, Thirlby, and others; and the emendation is supported by Dial. Tryph. c. 69, τοὺς ἐκ γενετῆς καὶ κατὰ τὴν σάρκα πηροὺς καὶ κωφοὺς καὶ χωλοὺς ἰάσατο.

XXIII. 1. ἵνα δὲ ἤδη κ. τ. λ. This chapter, which opens the second grand division of the entire Apology, has been a sore stumbling-block in the path of most of the commentators. Perhaps indeed none of them, with the exception of Otto, seems clearly to have fathomed its meaning; which it may therefore be advisable to point out with some precision. Having shewn the credibility of the Christian scheme even upon heathen principles, and the consequent unreasonableness of persecuting those who maintain it, Justin now proceeds to establish not only its probability but its absolute certainty, dividing his argument into three distinct propositions. To these three propositions combined the relative τοῦτο has a forward reference; and the particle ἵνα marks the dependence of the first clause of the chapter upon the words τοῦτον ἔλεγχον ποιησόμεθα, with which it concludes; so that the intermediate sentences comprise the statement, of which this ἔλεγχος, or proof, is contained in the subsequent chapters (cc. 24—60): and here

ἀληθὲς λέγομεν·—καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς μόνος ἰδίως υἱὸς τῷ Θεῷ γεγέννηται, λόγος αὐτοῦ ὑπάρχων καὶ πρωτότοκος καὶ δύναμις, καί, τῇ βουλῇ αὐτοῦ γενόμενος ἄνθρωπος, ταῦτα ἡμᾶς ἐδίδαξεν ἐπ' ἀλλαγῇ καὶ ἐπαναγωγῇ τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου γένους·—πρὶν ἢ ἐν ἀνθρώποις αὐτὸν γενέσθαι ἄνθρωπον, φθάσαντές τινες, διὰ τοὺς προειρημένους κακοὺς δαίμονας, διὰ τῶν ποιητῶν ὡς γενόμενα εἶπον, ἃ μυθοποιήσαντες ἔφησαν, ὃν τρόπον καὶ τὰ καθ' ἡμῶν λεγόμενα δύσφημα

also the relative τοῦτον is anticipative. The first position to be proved is the injustice of persecuting Christians for asserting the truth of all that Christ and the Prophets have taught, which rests not only on its agreement with the accounts of other writers, but also on independent testimony of its own; and the reasoning on this head runs through six chapters (cc. 24—29). Grabe, supposing that the subdivisions of this proof, πρῶτον, δεύτερον, τρίτον (cc. 24, 25, 26), bore upon the entire subject proposed for discussion in this paragraph, was necessarily led into a complete misconception of his author's views; and thence he and others have dreamt of nothing but corruptions and mutilations without end. With the assertion of Justin in this proposition may be compared Dial. Tryph. c. 7; Clem. Alex. Strom. VI. 15, 122.

6. καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς κ. τ. λ. This is Justin's second proposition, in which he undertakes to establish the doctrine of Christ's Incarnation, and the object which it was intended to effect in the conversion and restoration of mankind. The proof extends from c. 30 to c. 53 inclusive. It is clear that in introducing the clause, ὅτι is understood to be repeated; and in the next or concluding clause καὶ ὅτι must be mentally supplied.

10. πρὶν ἢ κ. τ. λ. In this third proposition, of which the proof will be found in cc. 54 sqq., Justin accounts for the similarity between some points of heathenism and Christianity, upon the supposition that the dæmons, having obtained some imperfect foreknowledge of the events of Christ's life on earth, enabled the heathen poets and mythologists to invent their fabulous histories, which may in some degree appear to anticipate them. Thus also Tertullian, in Apol. c. 47, *Omnia adversus veritatem de ipsa veritate constructa sunt, operantibus emulationem istam spiritibus erroris. Ab his adulteria hujusmodi salutaris disciplinæ suborta; ab his quædam etiam fabulæ immissæ, quæ de similitudine fidem veritatis infirmarent, vel eam sibi potius evincerent, ut quis ideo non putet Christianis credendum, quia nec poetis nec philosophis: vel ideo magis poetis et philosophis existimaret credendum, quia non Christianis.* It has been thought, however, that there is some error or corruption in the text; and it is not certainly very apparent of whom τινες is to be understood. Accordingly Otto is disposed to adopt the conjecture of the Benedictine editor, and read λέγω δὲ τοὺς προειρημένους κακοὺς δ. Perhaps however there is no need of any change; as τινες may represent generally the mythologists, who, *influenced by*—(διά with an accusative)—*the dæmons, related beforehand* (φθάσαντες εἶπον) *by the instrumentality of the poets*—(διά with a genitive)—*those circumstances as having really happened, which* (μυθοποιήσαντες ἔφησαν) *having fictitiously devised they narrated, in the same manner as they have energetically fabricated* (ἐνήργησαν) *the scandalous reports concerning us Christians.*

καὶ ἀσεβῆ ἔργα ἐνήργησαν, ὧν οὐδεὶς μάρτυς οὐδὲ ἀπόδειξίς ἐστι·—τοῦτον ἔλεγχον ποιησόμεθα.

XXIV. *Πρῶτον μὲν ὅτι, τὰ ὅμοια τοῖς Ἕλλησι λέγοντες, μόνοι μισούμεθα δι' ὄνομα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ μηδὲν ἀδικοῦντες ὡς ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀναιρούμεθα, ἄλλων ἀλλαχοῦ καὶ δένδρα σεβομένων καὶ ποταμοὺς καὶ μῦς καὶ αἰλούρους καὶ κροκοδείλους καὶ τῶν ἀλόγων ζώων τὰ πολλά, καὶ οὐ τῶν αὐτῶν ὑπὸ πάντων τιμωμένων, ἀλλὰ ἄλλων ἀλλαχόσε, ὥστ' εἶναι ἀσεβεῖς ἀλλήλοις πάντας διὰ τὸ μὴ τὰ αὐτὰ σέβειν. Ὅπερ μόνον ἐγκαλεῖν ἡμῖν ἔχετε, ὅτι μὴ τοὺς αὐτοὺς ὑμῖν σέβομεν θεούς, μηδὲ τοῖς ἀποθανοῦσι χοὰς καὶ κνίσας καὶ ἐν γραφαῖς στεφάνους καὶ θυσίας φέρομεν. Ὅτι*

With respect to the truth of Christianity, because its professors do not worship the same gods as the Romans, they are persecuted; while others are permitted to choose what deities they please.

14. *ὧν οὐδεὶς μάρτυς οὐδὲ ἀ. ἐ.* The reference of this want of proof to the *myths* of the dæmons as well as the calumnies against Christians, and the mode in which the two last propositions mutually bear upon each other, may be seen from the opening of c. 54: *οἱ δὲ παραδιδόντες τὰ μυθοποιηθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν ποιητῶν οὐδεμίαν ἀπόδειξιν φέρουσι τοῖς ἐκμανθάνουσι νέοις, καὶ ἐπὶ ἀπάτῃ καὶ ἀπαγωγῇ τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου γένους εἰρῆσθαι ἀποδείκνυμεν κατ' ἐνέργειαν τῶν φαύλων δαιμόνων.*

XXIV. 1. *ὅτι, τὰ ὅμοια κ. τ. λ.* It is obvious that *ἔλεγχον ποιοῦμεν* is understood, both here and in the following subdivisions, from the end of the last chapter.

3. *ἄλλων ἀλλαχοῦ κ. τ. λ.* Thus also Athenag. Legat. c. 14: *οὐδὲ οἱ ἡμῖν ἐπικαλοῦντες ἀθεότητα, ἐπεὶ μὴ τοὺς αὐτοὺς οἷς ἴσασι νομίζομεν, σφίσιν αὐτοῖς συμφωνοῦσι περὶ θεῶν.—Ἂν τοίνυν ἡμεῖς, ὅτι μὴ κοινῶς ἐκείνοις θεοσεβοῦμεν, ἀσεβῶμεν, πᾶσαι μὲν πόλεις, πάντα δὲ ἔθνη ἀσεβοῦσιν· οὐ γὰρ τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἄγουσι θεούς.* Origen. c. Cels. v. 27: *Ὅσιον παρὰ τοῖσδε μὲν σέβειν κροκόδειλον καὶ ἐσθίειν τι τῶν παρ' ἄλλοις προσκυνουμένων, καὶ ὅσιον ἑτέροις τὸ σέβειν τὸν μόσχον, καὶ παρ' ἄλλοις τὸν τράγον νομίζειν θεόν. Οὕτω δ' ἔσται ὁ αὐτὸς ὅσια μεν ποιῶν ὡς πρὸς τούσδε τοὺς νόμους, ἀνόσια δέ, ὡς πρὸς ἑτέρους· ὅπερ ἐστὶπ ἀντων ἀτοπώτατον.* Compare also Tatian. Orat. c. Græc. c. 10; Athanas. Orat. ad Gent. c. 23; Tertull. Apol. c. 24; Ad Scap. c. 2.

10. *ἐν γραφαῖς στεφάνους.* If this mean anything, it must be taken as an equivalent for *στεφάνους γεγραμμένους*, *painted crowns*. The Benedictine editor indeed contends that *γραφὴ* signifies not only *a picture*, but *a statue;* and interprets the words of the decoration of the statues of the gods. In this case the preposition *ἐν* is manifestly not only redundant, but inadmissible. There is indeed little doubt of some latent corruption, and various emendations have been proposed. Grabe, after Salmasius, proposes *ἐν ῥαφαῖς*, in the sense of *ῥαπτοὺς στεφάνους*, *crowns made by sewing;* and quotes the phrase *suere corollas* from Tertullian. The conjecture however is quite as harsh as the vulgar text, and gives a sense by no means preferable. Others, again, read *ἐν ταφαῖς* or *τάφοις*; and others *ἐγγραφούς*. From c. 9, *supra*, it might be easy to adopt *ἐν πλοκαῖς*. In the uncertainty of all conjecture, however, the text can only be left as it is.

γὰρ οὖν τὰ αὐτὰ παρ' οἷς μὲν θεοὶ, παρ' οἷς δὲ θηρία, παρ' οἷς δὲ ἱερεῖα νενομισμένα ἐστὶν, ἀκριβῶς ἐπίστασθε.

Still they prove the sincerity of their faith, by readily dying for it, and renouncing the abominations of heathenism for the sake of Christ, with pity for those who believe what can only be the invention of dæmons.

XXV. Δεύτερον δὲ, ὅτι ἐκ παντὸς γένους ἀνθρώπων οἱ πάλαι σεβόμενοι Διόνυσον τὸν Σεμέλης καὶ Ἀπόλλωνα τὸν Λητοΐδην, οἳ δι' ἔρωτας ἀρσένων ὅσα ἔπραξαν αἶσχος καὶ λέγειν, καὶ οἱ Περσεφόνην καὶ Ἀφροδίτην, τὰς διὰ τὸν Ἄδωνιν οἰστρηθείσας, ὧν καὶ τὰ μυστήρια ἄγετε, ἢ Ἀσκληπιὸν, ἤ τινα τῶν ἄλλων ὀνομαζομένων θεῶν, καίπερ θανάτου ἀπειλουμένου, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τούτων μὲν κατεφρονήσαμεν, Θεῷ δὲ τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ καὶ ἀπαθεῖ ἑαυτοὺς ἀνεθήκαμεν· ὃν οὔτε ἐπ' Ἀντιόπην καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ὁμοίως, οὐδὲ ἐπὶ Γανυμήδην δι' οἶστρον ἐληλυθέναι πειθόμεθα, οὐδὲ λυθῆναι βοηθείας τυχόντα διὰ Θέτιδος ὑπὸ τοῦ ἑκατοντάχειρος ἐκείνου, οὐδὲ μεριμνῶντα διὰ τοῦτο τὸν τῆς Θέτιδος Ἀχιλλέα διὰ τὴν παλλακίδα Βρισηΐδα ὀλέσαι πολλοὺς τῶν Ἑλλήνων. Καὶ τοὺς πειθομένους ἐλεοῦμεν, τοὺς δὲ τούτων αἰτίους δαίμονας γνωρίζομεν.

10. ὅτι γὰρ οὖν τὰ αὐτά. The MSS. and most edd. give ὅτι γὰρ οὐ, which is manifestly untenable. With the single exception of Grabe, who assigns no reason for his opinion, the editors in general are either prepared to cancel the negative, or substitute οὖν. Upon the whole, the latter seems to be preferable.

XXV. 1. οἱ πάλαι σεβόμενοι. So c. 14, οἱ πάλαι χαίροντες: and c. 39, οἱ πάλαι ἀλληλοφόνται. Without these examples, however, the critics would have had no difficulty in correcting the vulgar reading οἱ παλαιοί.

4. Περσ. καὶ Ἀφρ. τὰς διὰ τ. Ἄ. οἰστρ. Codd. Reg. et Clar. in margine: Κόρην καὶ Ἀφροδ. τὰς διὰ τ. Ἄδ. ἐρηθείσας. Sylburg would read Κ. καὶ Ἀ., τὴν μὲν διὰ τὸν Ἄδωνιν, τὴν δὲ διὰ τὸν Αἰδωνέα οἰστρηθεῖσαν. In the latter part of the conjecture Grabe coincides, but rejects the former; because, though Proserpine is called Κόρη in c. 64, *infra*, she was equally called Κόρη and Περσεφόνη. That there is as little cause for the other change will be seen from Apollod. Bibl. III. 13, 4; Macrob. Saturn. I. 21; Schol. ad Theocr. Idyl. III. 48, XV. 68. Compare Tatian. Orat. c. Græc. c. 13.

7. διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Sylburg, Grabe, and Thalemann would read διὰ Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν. Compare, however, cc. 49, 61. Of the readiness of Christians to die for their faith, Justin speaks also in c. 14; and again in Apol. I. c.45, II. c.4; Dial. Tryph. cc. 110, 119, 131, and elsewhere. The testimonies to the same effect in other Christian writers are too numerous to admit of citation.

11. ἑκατοντάχειρος ἐκείνου. *Briareus.*

12. διὰ τοῦτο. *On this account:* i.e. on account of the assistance rendered by Briareus at the instigation of Thetis. See Hom. Il. A. 401 sqq., 503 sqq.; B. 3, 4.

XXVI. Τρίτον δὲ, ὅτι καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνέλευσιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς οὐρανὸν προεβάλλοντο οἱ δαίμονες ἀνθρώπους τινὰς λέγοντας ἑαυτοὺς εἶναι θεούς, οἳ οὐ μόνον οὐκ ἐδιώχθησαν ὑφ' ὑμῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τιμῶν κατηξιώθησαν· Σίμωνα μέν τινα Σαμαρέα τὸν ἀπὸ κώμης λεγομένης Γιττῶν, ὃς ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος διὰ τῆς τῶν ἐνεργούντων δαιμόνων τέχνης δυνάμεις ποιήσας μαγικὰς ἐν τῇ πόλει ὑμῶν βασιλίδι Ῥώμῃ, θεὸς ἐνομίσθη, καὶ ἀνδριάντι παρ' ὑμῶν ὡς Θεὸς τετίμηται, ὃς ἀνδριὰς ἀνεγήγερται ἐν τῷ Τίβερι ποταμῷ μεταξὺ τῶν δύο γεφυρῶν, ἔχων ἐπιγραφὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν ταύτην.

ΣΙΜΩΝΙ ΔΕΩ ΣΑΓΚΤΩ.

There have been heretics indeed; but Christianity is no more answerable for their errors and iniquities, than is Philosophy for those of its different sects. These too were not only unassailed by persecution, but held in high estimation. Such was SIMON *the Samaritan.*

XXVI. 1. *μετὰ τὴν ἀνέλευσιν τοῦ X.* Eusebius, who has borrowed the whole of Justin's account of Simon, with some trifling variations (H. E. III. 13), reads *ἀνάληψιν τοῦ κυρίου* for *ἀνέλευσιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ.* So likewise Syncellus (*Chron.* p. 333), and Zonaras (*Annal.* t. II. p. 187), who also follow Justin's description of the heretic. The reading of the text is fully confirmed by Dial. Tryph. cc. 39, 87. The other various readings, which appear in the passage as cited by the historians successively, will be noticed as they occur.

2. *προεβάλλοντο.* So Codd. Reg. Clar.; also Syncellus, and some MSS. of Eusebius. The editions of Eusebius, however, and some MSS. have *προεβάλοντο* in the aorist, which here also Edd. Ben. and Br. have exhibited in the text.

4. *τιμῶν κατηξιώθησαν.* Zonar. *τιμῆς.* Euseb. Sync. Zonar. *ἠξιώθησαν.*

— *Σίμωνα μέν κ. τ. λ.* Zonar. *ὧν εἷς καὶ Σίμων ὁ Σαμαρεὺς ὁ ἀπὸ κώμης κ. τ. λ.* With the accusative in the text, *προεβάλλοντο* must of course be repeated.

5. *Γιττῶν.* The reading of the MSS. and Ed. Steph., *Τρίτον*, is manifestly erroneous. In other editions the name is variously accentuated, *Γίττων* or *Γιττῶν.* It should seem that the latter is correct. Syncellus has *Γαιτθίων.* Other writers call the place of Simon's birth either *Γιτθῶν*, *Γετθῶν*, *Γητθῶν*, or *Γητῶν.* Compare Epiphan. Hær. 21; Theodoret. Fab. Hær. I. 1; Pseudo-Clem. Hom. II. 22. See also Constitt. Apost. VI. 7, and Clericus *ad loc.*

6. *διὰ τῆς τῶν ἐν. δ. τέχνης.* Zonar. *διὰ τῆς τῶν δ. ἐνεργείας.*

— *δυνάμεις ποιήσας μ.* Euseb. *δυνάμεις μ. π.*

7. *ἐν τῇ πόλει ὑμῶν β.* Euseb. *ἐπὶ τῇ πόλει ὑμῶν τῇ β.* Sync. *ἐν τῇ πόλει ἡμῶν τῇ β.* Zonar. *ἐν τῇ πόλει ὑμῶν τῇ β.*

8. *παρ' ὑμῶν.* Euseb. *παρ' ὑμῖν.* Zonaras omits the words *ὡς Θεὸς*; and all the three historians, who quote the passage, omit *ὃς ἀνδριὰς ἀνεγήγερται.* For the words which follow, Zonaras writes *Τιβέριδι ποταμῷ ἱσταμένῳ, γράμμασιν ἐπιγεγραμμένῳ Ῥωμαϊκοῖς.*

11. ΣΙΜΩΝΙ ΔΕΩ ΣΑΓΚΤΩ. There seems to be very little doubt, though his argument is not affected by the mistake, that Justin was either deceived by a too hasty reading, or imposed upon by a false report of the inscription which is here recorded. Though he again mentions the statue erected to Simon in c. 56, and is followed in his account by Irenæus (Hær. I. 23, 1), Tertullian (Apol. c. 13), Eusebius (H. E. II. 13), Cyril of Jerusalem (Catechism. VI. 14), Augustin (Hæres.

12 Καὶ σχεδὸν πάντες μὲν Σαμαρεῖς, ὀλίγοι δὲ καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις ἔθνεσιν, ὡς τὸν πρῶτον θεὸν ἐκεῖνον ὁμολογοῦντες, προσ-

c. 1), and other writers; still it is only a perpetuation of the same mistake, originally promulgated on his authority. The statue by which he was misled was in all probability one dedicated to the Sabine god *Semo Sancus*, a deity presiding over *treaties* and *covenants*, and thus named *a sanciendo*. See Ovid. Fast. VI. 213 sqq.; Lactant. Inst. Div. I. 15. It was not however until the year A.D. 1574 that the accuracy of Justin was called in question. In the island on the Tiber, about the very spot indicated in the text, the base of a statue was in that year dug up, bearing an inscription which a careless reader might easily have perverted into that given by the Apologist, but really indicating the deity above mentioned. It is true indeed that there are some trifling points in the statement of Justin, and the Fathers who adopt his account, with which the inscription in question does not exactly coincide; and the correctness of the former has accordingly been vindicated by Baronius, Tillemont, Thirlby, and others; and more recently by Dr. Burton, in his *Bampton Lectures*, note 46, p. 374. He does not seem, however, to have been so successful in his defence, as to have set aside the very manifest probability that Justin was misled by the subjoined inscription, which is taken from Gruter (Inscript. Antiq. t. I. p. 96, n. 5):—SEMONI | SANCO | DEO FIDIO | SACRUM | SEX. POMPEIUS SP. F. | COL. MUSSIANUS | QUINQUENNALIS | DECUR. | BIDENTALIS | DONUM DEDIT. By Eusebius, Syncellus, and Zonaras, the Greek interpretation, ὅπερ ἐστι Σίμωνι θεῷ ἁγίῳ, is added.

12. σχέδον πάντες μὲν Σ. Euseb. σχ. μὲν πάντες.

13. ὡς τὸν πρῶτον θεὸν κ. τ. λ. There is a manifest reference to this passage in Dial. Tryph. c. 120: οὐδὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους τοῦ ἐμοῦ, λέγω δὲ τῶν Σαμαρέων, τινὸς φροντίδα ποιούμενος, ἐγγράφως Καίσαρι προσομιλῶν εἶπον πλανᾶσθαι αὐτοὺς πειθομένους τῷ ἐν τῷ γένει αὐτῶν μάγῳ Σίμωνι, ὃν θεὸν ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως εἶναι λέγουσι. See Introd. Obss. p. 6, and compare Apol. II. 15. With respect to the history and heresy of Simon, it may be proper to subjoin a brief account gathered from the work of Irenæus *contra hæreses*, or as it is called, according to the Greek title preserved by Eusebius (H. E. V. 7), Ἔλεγχος καὶ ἀνατροπὴ τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως. Compare 1 Tim. VI. 20. It thence appears that, sometime after St. Peter's severe rebuke of Simon, and his temporary penitence (Acts xiii. 9, 20), the heretic proceeded to Rome, and there remained during Nero's persecution. In order to avoid the sufferings inflicted on the Christians, he maintained that idolatry was a matter of indifference; and it is scarcely surprising that his doctrine was adopted by many. His popularity was doubtless increased by his skill in *magic*, and in the exhibition of lying wonders which he performed with remarkable dexterity; and it seems to be upon the credit of this *legerdemain* that, as Irenæus (I. 23, 1) agrees with Justin in affirming, he was worshipped as a god. There is a tradition that, emboldened by his mechanical skill, and trusting to dæmoniacal assistance, he raised himself into the air in a fiery chariot; that the dæmons forsaking him at the prayers of St. Peter, he was precipitated to the ground and broke both his legs; and that enraged at his failure, he put an end to his life by throwing himself from the top of a house to the bottom. The story, however, is not mentioned by Irenæus, nor is it very credible in itself, except indeed under considerable limitations. It is first noticed in Arnob.

κυνοῦσι· καὶ Ἑλένην τινὰ τὴν περινοστήσασαν αὐτῷ κατ' ἐκεῖνο τοῦ καιροῦ, πρότερον ἐπὶ τέγους σταθεῖσαν, τὴν

c. Gent. II. *Viderant currum Simonis Magi et quadrigas igneas Petri ore difflatas, et nominato Christo evanuisse.* Possibly he may have attempted to delude the people by some artifice into a belief of his supernatural powers; and the prayers of the Apostle having been instrumental in detecting the fraud, he was induced by his disappointment to commit suicide. As to his doctrines, it was a notion of the Platonists that from the *Ideas* in the Divine Mind proceeded certain *Intelligences*, which were employed by the Deity in the creation of the world: and upon this notion, combined with that of the mystical *Sephiroth* of the Jewish *Cabala*, and the oriental fiction of the two principles, were founded those interpretations of Scripture from which his system was derived. He maintained that the Supreme God was not the Creator of the world, but that one of a successive generation of *Æons*, emanating from the Deity, became the *Demiurgus*, contrary to the will of the Creator; and that from his tyranny Christ, the last of the *Æons*, was sent to deliver mankind. To this fancy, connected with his belief in the *Transmigration of Souls*, should doubtless be referred the allegorical fiction, for such it seems to be, of the female by whom he was attended. Irenæus, more fully than Justin, represents her to have been a Tyrian prostitute, named *Helena*, whom he identified, among others, with the *teterrima causa* of the Trojan war; and, carrying her about with him, described her as the *first conception of his mind*, the mother of all things, by whom he had created angels and archangels, and by their means the world. Among other doctrines maintained by Simon, he set on foot the notion that Christ was a mere phantom, having no material body; he denied a general resurrection; he taught that the prophets of the Old Testament were not inspired by the Supreme God, but by the creative *Æon;* and he asserted the perfect freedom of his followers to follow their own pleasure, inasmuch as *secundum ipsius gratiam servari homines, et non secundum operas justas.* Irenæus says also that among the Samaritans he declared himself to be *God the Father;* among the Jews, to be the *Son;* and among Gentiles, the *Holy Ghost.*

13. ἐκεῖνον καὶ προσκυνοῦσι. Syncell. καὶ σχέδον μὲν πάντες προσκυνοῦσι. Eusebius omits the words ἐκεῖνον καὶ, and upon his authority the Benedictine editor and Braunius eject them, unnecessarily, from the text.

14. καὶ Ἑλένην τινὰ κ. τ. λ. Iren. Hær. I. 23, 2: *Hic Helenam secum circumducebat, dicens hanc esse primam mentis ejus conceptionem, matrem omnium, per quam, mota mente, concepit angelos facere et archangelos. Hanc enim Ennoiam, &c.* For *Helenam*, some copies of Irenæus read *Selenen;* and it is worthy of remark that a like companion, called *Luna*, is attributed by the Clementine *Recognitions* (II. 12) to Dositheus, a contemporary and coheretic with Simon. Instead of περινοστήσασαν, which is the reading of the MSS., Sylburg, Maranus, and Braunius read συμπερινοστήσασαν. Syncellus omits the article.

15. ἐπὶ τέγους στ. A formula denoting *a prostitute;* τέγος sometimes signifying *a brothel.* See Vales. ad. Euseb. l. c. Syncellus reads στέγους. After σταθεῖσαν Eusebius adds ἐν Τύρῳ τῆς Φοινίκης. From Eusebius also the Benedictine and other editors have adopted ἀπ' αὐτοῦ in the following clause for ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. By the same historian the words ἔννοιαν πρώτην are transposed, and the participle γενομένην omitted.

Such also were Menander; ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἔννοιαν πρώτην γενομένην λέγουσι. Μένανδρον δέ τινα, καὶ αὐτὸν Σαμαρέα τὸν ἀπὸ κώμης Καππαρεταΐας, γενόμενον μαθητὴν τοῦ Σίμωνος ἐνεργηθέντα καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν δαιμονίων, καὶ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ γενόμενον πολλοὺς ἐξαπατῆσαι διὰ μαγικῆς τέχνης οἴδαμεν· ὃς καὶ τοὺς αὐτῷ ἑπομένους ὡς μηδὲ ἀποθνήσκοιεν ἔπεισε· καὶ νῦν εἰσί τινες ἀπ' ἐκείνου τοῦτο ὁμολογοῦντες. *And Marcion.* Μαρκίωνα δέ τινα Ποντικὸν, ὃς καὶ νῦν

16. *Μένανδρον δέ τινα κ. τ. λ.* This account of *Menander* is cited in Euseb. III. 26. The heretic was a disciple of Simon, and adopted his tenets with a few Gnostic additions. Tertull. de Præscr. Hær. c. 46, *Quicquid se Simon dixerat, hoc se Menander esse dicebat.* Compare Epiphan. Hær. 22. Irenæus (Hær. I. 21) says that he maintained *primam virtutem incognitam esse omnibus; se autem missum esse Salvatorem pro salute hominum.* He advised his followers to abjure martyrdom; and maintained that his baptism was a true resurrection, rendering those who received it incapable of death, and unassailable by the infirmities of age. See Tertull. de Anim. cc. 23, 50; De Resurr. Carn. c. 5.

17. Καππαρεταΐας. Euseb. Καπαραττaίας.

18. *ἐνεργηθέντα καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν δ.* Euseb. *οἰστρηθέντα καὶ αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν δαιμόνων.* Towards the end of the sentence Eusebius also has *μὴ* for *μηδὲ*, and transposes the words *εἰσί τινες.*

22. *Μαρκίωνα δέ τινα κ. τ. λ.* Eusebius cites this account of Marcion in H. E. IV. 11; but as if it occurred in a book written expressly against that heretic. That Justin did write a work against heresies in general, he tells us at the end of this chapter; and Irenæus (Hær. IV. 14) mentions his *σύνταγμα πρὸς Μαρκίωνα*; whence it is possible that the reference of Eusebius may have been accidentally made to one of these works instead of the Apology. The heretic was born at Sinope, in Pontus, in the early part of the second century. He was originally a member of the church at Rome, and had subscribed a considerable sum of money to the common fund; but he was induced by the love of novelty to concoct a religious system of his own, in the formation of which he borrowed largely from the opinions of his preceptor *Cerdon.* Maintaining that the law and the gospel contradicted each other, he built upon this notion the doctrine of *two* Gods; and taught that one of them, who gave the law, created the world, and was the author of evil; and that the other, who was revealed by Christ, was a deity of pure benevolence, who would neither judge, nor condemn, nor punish. This, his main error, originated in a wish to reconcile the existence of evil with the goodness of God; and in order to support it he wrote a book, entitled *Antitheses*, in which he attempted to prove, by an opposition of apparent contradictions, that the *Law* and the *Gospel* could not have proceeded from the same source. He also affirmed that Christ had not a real body, and that the Saviour of the New Testament, and the Christ predicted in the Old, were distinct individuals: he rejected the doctrine of the resurrection; denied the freedom of the will; prohibited marriage; and not only mutilated the Scriptures, but compiled a Gospel of his own, taken chiefly from that of St. Luke, and adapted to the inculcation of his peculiar tenets. Towards the end of his life he renounced his errors, but died before he could obtain re-admission into the church, from which he had been repeatedly ejected. By some, indeed, his

ἔτι ἐστὶ διδάσκων τοὺς πειθομένους, ἄλλον τινὰ νομίζειν μείζονα τοῦ δημιουργοῦ θεόν· ὃς κατὰ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων διὰ τῆς τῶν δαιμόνων συλλήψεως πολλοὺς πεποίηκε βλασφημίας λέγειν, καὶ ἀρνεῖσθαι τὸν ποιητὴν τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς Θεόν, ἄλλον δέ τινα, ὡς ὄντα μείζονα, τὰ μείζονα παρὰ τοῦτον ὁμολογεῖν πεποιηκέναι. Πάντες οἱ ἀπὸ τούτων ὁρμώμενοι, ὡς ἔφημεν, Χριστιανοὶ καλοῦνται, ὃν τρόπον καὶ οἱ

excommunication has been doubted; but the above is a brief analysis of Tertullian's account, who wrote a treatise against Marcion in five books, and is supposed on this point to have confounded Marcion and Cerdon. For an excellent digest of the opinions of this heretic, see Bishop Kaye's *Tertullian*, c VII. pp. 474 sqq. In conclusion it may be proper to remark, that most of the Fathers date the first appearance of Marcion in the reign of Antoninus Pius. Thus, according to Irenæus (Hær. III. 4), he flourished under *Anicetus*, who was the *tenth* Bishop of Rome, and held his episcopate under that emperor, between the years 158 and 169. See Euseb. H. E. IV. 19. An objection thus arises, which has been inadvertently overlooked in the *Introductory Observations*, against the date of the Apology there adopted; since it appears from this passage that, at the period when it was written, the opinions of Marcion had been extensively circulated. Not only, however, are the primitive writers somewhat uncertain guides in questions of chronology, but on this very point there is reason to dissent from their statements. Since Tertullian (c. Marc. I. 19) says of him that *Antonianus hæreticus est sub Pio impius*, it may fairly be presumed that he was not first heard of under the Antonines: and Clement of Alexandria (Strom. VII. 17) remarks, that about the age of Adrian and the Antonines, ὡς πρεσβύτης νεωτέροις συνεγένετο. Epiphanius, though in one place (Hær. XLII. 12) he makes him contemporary with Anicetus, refers him in another (Hær. XLVIII. 1) to the reign of Adrian. No valid argument can therefore be alleged from Justin's notice of Marcion against the date in question.

23. νομίζειν μείζονα. Euseb. εἶναι νομίζειν μείζω. Sylburg was mistaken in alleging ὀνομάζειν as the reading of the historian.

24. ὃς κατᾶ παν γ. Euseb. ὃς καὶ κατὰ π. γ. This is perhaps the preferable reading, unless indeed the relative would be better away.

25. πεποίηκε βλασφημίας λέγειν. Euseb. πέπεικε βλάσφημα λέγειν. For the word Θεὸν in the next line, Eusebius has substituted πατέρα εἶναι τοῦ Χριστοῦ. It is clear, from what follows, that Justin wrote the passage, as exhibited in the text, not to mention that the change is inconsistent with Marcion's opinions.

27. τὰ μείζονα. These words, though essential to the sense, are omitted by Eusebius. Possibly they were overlooked, by reason of the word μείζονα preceding.

29. ὡς ἔφημεν. See above, c. 7. Eusebius has ἔφαμεν, and reads the preceding clause, Καὶ πάντες οἱ ἀ. τ. ὡρμημένοι. What follows runs thus—καὶ οὐ κοινῶν ὄντων δογμ. τ. φ. τὸ ἐπικαλούμενον ὄν. τ. φ. κ. ἐστι. With respect to the participle ἐπικαλούμενον, there seems to be weighty reason for admitting it into Justin's text; though, in the absence of all authority, it would be hazardous to do so. It is true that Justin has used ἐπικατηγορούμενον in the passage to which

οὐ κοινωνοῦντες τῶν αὐτῶν δογμάτων τοῖς φιλοσόφοις τὸ ἐπικατηγορούμενον ὄνομα τῆς φιλοσοφίας κοινὸν ἔχουσιν. Εἰ δὲ καὶ τὰ δύσφημα ἐκεῖνα μυθολογούμενα ἔργα πράττουσι, λυχνίας μὲν ἀνατροπὴν, καὶ τὰς ἀνέδην μίξεις, καὶ ἀνθρωπείων σαρκῶν βορὰς, οὐ γινώσκομεν· ἀλλ' ὅτι μὴ διώκονται μηδὲ φονεύονται ὑφ' ὑμῶν, κἂν διὰ τὰ δόγματα, ἐπιστάμεθα. Ἔστι δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ σύνταγμα κατὰ πασῶν τῶν γεγενημένων αἱρέσεων συντεταγμένον· ᾧ, εἰ βούλεσθε ἐντυχεῖν, δώσομεν.

The charge of *devouring Infants* retorted upon the heathen, whose *exposition* of their children induced the most flagrant enormities.

XXVII. Ἡμεῖς δὲ, ἵνα μηδένα διώκωμεν, μηδὲ ἀσεβῶμεν, ἐκτιθέναι καὶ τὰ γεννώμενα πονηρῶν εἶναι δεδιδάγμεθα·

he reverts, but there it appropriately designates the *calumniated* name of *Christianity;* whereas it is equally out of place as applied to the name of *Philosophy*, against which no *accusations* were alleged.

32. τὰ δύσφημα ἐκεῖνα κ. τ. λ. The calumnious charges, so industriously circulated against the early Christians, have been briefly noticed in the *Introductory Observations*, p. 4. To these, which Justin here specifies, and which Athenagoras (Legat. c. 3) states to have been designated Θυέστεια δεῖπνα and Οἰδιποδείους μίξεις, he again adverts in Apol. II. c. 12; Dial. Tryph. cc. 10, 17, 108. The student will find a full description and refutation of them in Minuc. F. Oct. cc. 9, 30. Doubtless they arose out of imperfect reports or misrepresentations of the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and the expressions of *eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ*, employed in the service; the nightly meetings and agapæ, which were necessarily held in secret; and the appellation of *brother* and *sister*, by which the Christians addressed each other. At first sight Justin appears to insinuate that these crimes, though falsely alleged against Christians generally, might have been perpetrated by some heretics; and it is certain that the Gnostics were addicted to the grossest immoralities; but, whatever his suspicions may have been, he candidly avows that he had no proof of their being well founded. He simply asserts that they are punished, if at all, not for their opinions, but their crimes; and that he had himself prepared a refutation of their doctrines, from which he tacitly inferred the truth of the orthodox faith. Indeed the very argument which Justin, assuming the truth of Christianity, employs to shew that its professors are the only sufferers in the cause of truth, other writers use to demonstrate that theirs is the only true religion. Compare Cyprian. Epist. 57, 58.

36. ἔστι δὲ ἡμῖν κ. τ. λ. This sentence is also cited in Euseb. H. E. IV. 11. He rejects, however, the word συντεταγμένον. It is manifest from the statement which it contains, that Justin's *Treatise against Heretics* must have been written at an earlier period than that to which it has been inadvertently assigned in the *Introductory Observations*, p. 7. In all probability it was written in the reign of *Adrian*.

37. ἐντυχεῖν. See on c. 14, 3.

XXVII. 1. ἵνα μηδένα διώκωμεν μ. ἀσ. In the end of the next chapter the nouns ἀσέβεια καὶ ἀδικία occur in conjunction; and thence, although there is no connexion between the passages, Grabe, Thirlby, and others would have read μηδένα ἀδικῶμεν, μηδὲν ἀδικῶμεν, or μηδὲ ἀδ. Now Justin is shewing that

πρῶτον μὲν, ὅτι τοὺς πάντας σχεδὸν ὁρῶμεν ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ προάγοντας οὐ μόνον τὰς κόρας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἄρσενας, καὶ, ὃν τρόπον λέγονται οἱ παλαιοὶ ἀγέλας βοῶν ἢ αἰγῶν ἢ προβάτων τρέφειν, ἢ ἵππων φορβάδων, οὕτω νῦν καὶ παῖδας εἰς τὸ αἰσχρῶς χρῆσθαι μόνον· καὶ ὁμοίως θηλειῶν καὶ ἀνδρογύνων καὶ ἀῤῥητοποιῶν πλῆθος κατὰ πᾶν ἔθνος ἐπὶ τούτου τοῦ ἄγους ἕστηκε. Καὶ *τούτων μισθοὺς καὶ εἰσφορὰς καὶ τέλη λαμβάνετε, δέον ἐκκόψαι ἀπὸ τῆς ὑμετέρας οἰκουμένης· καὶ τῶν τούτοις χρωμένων τις, πρὸς τῇ ἀθέῳ καὶ ἀσεβεῖ καὶ ἀκρατεῖ μίξει, εἰ τύχοι, τέκνῳ ἢ συγγενεῖ ἢ ἀδελφῷ μίγνυται.* Οἱ *δὲ καὶ τὰ ἑαυτῶν τέκνα καὶ τὰς*

Christians are so far from being guilty of the alleged crime of *devouring children*, that they abstain even from the heathen custom of *exposing* them, and that for two reasons; because, in the first place, children so exposed are invariably brought up to infamy, and secondly, because the death of any so treated would involve them in the guilt of murder (c. 29). The double crime attaching to the practice of exposition he briefly expresses in the outset, reversing the order in which the argument is conducted, by the verbs *διώκειν* and *ἀσεβεῖν*, of which the former is certainly better adapted to the meaning which it is thus intended to convey, than *ἀδικεῖν*. Some conjectures have also been proposed in relation to the clause, *ἐκτιθέναι κ. τ. λ.* They are, however, not worth recording; and probably the notion that *καὶ τὰ γεννώμενα* may have arisen out of *παιδία γεννώμενα* is about as worthless as the rest.

6. *οὕτω νῦν καὶ παῖδας.* *Scil.* *ὁρῶμεν ὑμᾶς τρέφειν.* Not observing this ellipsis, to be supplied from the foregoing clause, Grabe proposed to read *παῖδες* or *παίδων*. With respect to the odious practice which Justin reprobates, the same accusation is brought against the Romans in similar terms, in Tatian. Orat. c. Græc. c. 28, *παιδεραστία προνομίας ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων ἠξίωται, παίδων ἀγέλας ὥσπερ ἵππων φορβάδων συναγείρειν αὐτῶν πειρωμένων.* So Clem. Alex. Pæd. III. 4, *οἰνοχόων τε ὅμιλος ἀσκεῖται παρ' αὐτοῖς, καὶ μειρακίων ὡραίων ἀγέλαι, καθάπερ θρεμμάτων.* Compare Athenag. Legat. c. 34.

9. *μισθοὺς καὶ εἰσφοράς.* The taxes derived from prostitution, which were first imposed by Caligula, and modified by Alexander Severus, were abolished by Justinian. See Sueton. Calig. c. 4; Æl. Lamprid. V. Alex. Sev. c. 24; Cod. Justin. XI. 41, 6. For *ἡμετέρας*, the reading of the MSS., most of the editions correctly substitute *ὑμετέρας*, and Otto aptly adduces the following parallel, which also exhibits the word *οἰκουμένη* in the same sense which it here bears, from Xiphilin. in Neron. p. 179, (ed. Steph.):—*τὸ δὲ κήρυγμα ἦν,* Νέρων Καῖσαρ *νικᾷ τόνδε τὸν ἀγῶνα, καὶ στεφανοῖ τόν τε τῶν* Ῥωμαίων *δῆμον καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν οἰκουμένην.*

11. *καὶ τῶν τούτοις χρ. κ. τ. λ.* Lactant. Inst. Div. VI. 20, *Quis dubitet quin impius sit, qui, etiamsi contingat ei quod voluit ut alatur, addixit certe sanguinem suum vel ad servitutem, vel ad lupanar? Quæ autem possint vel soleant accidere in utroque sexu, vel per errorem, quis non intellegit? quis ignorat? Quod vel unius Œdipodis declarat exemplum, duplici scelere confusum.* See also Clem. Alex. Pæd. III. 3, 21; Tertull. Apol. c. 9; Ad Nat. I. 16; Minuc. F. Octav. c. 31.

ὁμοζύγους προαγωγεύονται· καὶ φανερῶς εἰς κιναιδίαν ἀποκόπτονταί τινες, καὶ εἰς μητέρα θεῶν τὰ μυστήρια ἀναφέρουσι, καὶ παρὰ παντὶ τῶν νομιζομένων παρ' ὑμῖν θεῶν ὄφις σύμβολον μέγα καὶ μυστήριον ἀναγράφεται. Καὶ τὰ φανερῶς ὑμῖν πραττόμενα καὶ τιμώμενα, ὡς ἀνατετραμμένου καὶ οὐ παρόντος φωτὸς θείου, ἡμῖν προσγράφετε· ὅπερ ἀπηλλαγμένοις ἡμῖν τοῦ πράττειν τι τούτων οὐ βλάβην φέρει, ἀλλὰ τοῖς πράττουσι καὶ ψευδομαρτυροῦσι μᾶλλον.

A remark that heathenism is distinguished from Christianity by making a serpent the emblem of God instead of the Devil, leads to a passing observation on the final doom of wicked spirits and wicked men.

XXVIII. *Παρ' ἡμῖν μὲν γὰρ ὁ ἀρχηγέτης τῶν κακῶν δαιμόνων ὄφις καλεῖται, καὶ σατανᾶς, καὶ διάβολος, ὡς καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἡμετέρων συγγραμμάτων ἐρευνήσαντες μαθεῖν δύνασθε· ὃν εἰς τὸ πῦρ πεμφθήσεσθαι μετὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ στρατιᾶς καὶ τῶν ἑπομένων ἀνθρώπων, κολασθησομένους τὸν ἀπέραντον αἰῶνα, προεμήνυσεν ὁ Χριστός. Καὶ γὰρ ἡ ἐπιμονὴ τοῦ*

14. *καὶ φανερῶς κ. τ. λ.* See Prudent. Hymn. XIV. 1066, and the Interpp. *ad loc.*

16. *θεῶν.* Vulgo, *θεῷ.* The emendation of Sylburg has been properly adopted by Braunius and Otto, as far preferable to reading *τῷ νομιζομένῳ* in the singular. Of the antient *Ophiolatria*, see Deane's Treatise on the subject.

19. *φωτὸς θείου.* By some this is understood of *mental illumination*, or the light of reason; but there is a manifest reference to *λυχνίας ἀναστροφὴ* in c. 26. Justin frequently imputes to the heathen the *open* practice of the enormities which the Christians were represented as performing in secret. So Apol. I. c. 10, II. c. 12. Compare Athenag. Legat. c. 34.

XXVIII. 1. *παρ' ἡμῖν μὲν γὰρ ὁ ἀρχηγέτης κ. τ. λ.* So Dial. Tryph. c. 103, *τὸν διάβολον, ὃν Μωσῆς μὲν ὄφιν καλεῖ, ἐν δὲ τῷ Ἰὼβ καὶ τῷ Ζαχαρίᾳ διάβολος κέκληται, καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ σατανᾶς προσηγόρευται.* Compare also cc. 45, 100, 124, 125.

2. *ἐκ τῶν ἡμετέρων συγγ.* See Rev. xx. 2.

6. *καὶ γὰρ ἡ ἐπιμονὴ κ. τ. λ.* So again in c. 45, *ὅτι δὲ ἔμελλε κατέχειν ἕως ἂν πατάξῃ τοὺς ἐχθραίνοντας αὐτῷ δαίμονας, καὶ συντελεσθῇ ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν προεγνωσμένων αὐτῷ ἀγαθῶν γινομένων καὶ ἐναρέτων, δι' οὓς καὶ μηδέπω τὴν ἐπικύρωσιν πεποίηται, ἐπακούσατε κ. τ. λ.* Apol. II. 7, *ἐπιμένει ὁ Θεὸς τὴν σύγχυσιν καὶ κατάλυσιν τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου μὴ ποιῆσαι, ἵνα καὶ οἱ φαῦλοι ἄγγελοι καὶ δαίμονες καὶ ἄνθρωποι μηκέτι ὦσι, διὰ τὸ σπέρμα τῶν Χριστιανῶν.* Dial. Tryph. c. 39, *καὶ νῦν οὐδέπω τὴν κρίσιν ἐπήνεγκεν ἢ ἐπάγει, γινώσκων ἔτι καθ' ἡμέραν τινὰς μαθητευομένους εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀπολειπόντας τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς πλάνης.* In these and some other passages of a similar tendency, in which he maintains that the punishment of the wicked angels is deferred till the end of the world, out of consideration for mankind, Justin has been supposed to contradict the doctrine laid down by St. Jude (v. 6), that they are *reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day.* Perhaps he only meant, as Bishop Kaye remarks (p. 110), that their power of doing mischief, in which their sole gratification consists, would then be taken

μηδέπω τοῦτο πρᾶξαι τὸν Θεὸν διὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον γένος γεγένηται. Προγινώσκει γάρ τινας ἐκ μετανοίας σωθήσεσθαι μέλλοντας, καί τινας μηδέπω ἴσως γεννηθέντας. Καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν νοερὸν καὶ δυνάμενον αἱρεῖσθαι τἀληθῆ, καὶ εὖ πράττειν, τὸ γένος τὸ ἀνθρώπινον πεποίηκεν, ὥστ' ἀναπολόγητον εἶναι τοῖς πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ· λογικοὶ γὰρ καὶ θεωρητικοὶ γεγένηνται. Εἰ δέ τις ἀπιστεῖ μέλειν τούτων τῷ Θεῷ, ἢ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὸν διὰ τέχνης ὁμολογήσει, ἢ ὄντα χαίρειν κακίᾳ φήσει, ἢ λίθῳ ἐοικότα μένειν, καὶ μηδὲν εἶναι ἀρετὴν μηδὲ κακίαν, δόξῃ δὲ μόνον τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἢ ἀγαθὰ ἢ κακὰ ταῦτα ἡγεῖσθαι· ἥπερ μεγίστη ἀσέβεια καὶ ἀδικία ἐστί.

Regarding the exposition of infants as murder, Christians marry with a view to the education of their children; while those who are unmarried maintain the most irreproachable chastity.

XXIX. Καὶ πάλιν, μὴ τῶν ἐκτεθέντων τις μὴ ἀναληφθεὶς θανατωθῇ, καὶ ὦμεν ἀνδροφόνοι· ἀλλ' ἢ τὴν ἀρχὴν οὐκ

away, and the unmitigated misery, for which they are reserved, be then finally inflicted on them. Such a view of the case is clearly not inconsistent with the language of Scripture. See Matt. viii. 29; Eph. ii. 2, vi. 12. There is something similar in Tertull. Apol. c. 41, *Qui enim semel æternum judicium destinavit post sæculi finem, non præcipitat discretionem, quæ est conditio judicii, ante sæculi finem.*

8. προγινώσκει γάρ τινας κ. τ. λ. It is clear that this *fore-knowledge* was not connected in Justin's mind with any idea of an *absolute predestination;* for he adds immediately, that *man was created an intelligent being, capable of choosing the truth and acting right, so that there is no excuse for any man before God.* See also on c. 10, 15. There may be some doubt whether εὖ πράττειν here signifies *to do well* or *to be happy;* but perhaps, upon the whole, Otto is right in thinking the former sense most agreeable with the context. Cf. c. 43, *infra.* The same sentiment is expressed in Iren. Hær. IV. 71, *Hominem liberum fecit Deus ab initio, habentem suam potestatem sicut et suam animam, ad utendum sententia Dei voluntariè, et non coactum a Deo.* See also Tertul. c. Marc. II.

13. τούτων. Those things which concern the salvation of mankind.

14. διὰ τέχνης. *Evasively, indirectly.* The expression implies what is not asserted *plainly* and *openly,* but *insinuated* or *implied.* Thus in the Epist. ad Zen. et Seren. c. 15, it is opposed to ἐκ προδήλου. Compare Dial. Tryph. c. 54; Ælian. V. H. XII. 33; Herodian. VIII. 4, 28. Hence the conjectural emendations which have been proposed, διακενῆς, ἀτεχνῶς, and δι' ἀνάγκης, are alike useless; as are also πάσῃ and φύσει, which Thirlby and Hermann would respectively substitute for φήσει, in the following clause.

XXIX. 1. καὶ πάλιν. *Scil.* παιδία ἐκτιθέναι δεδοίκαμεν. Justin now returns to the subject of *exposing* children, from which he digressed in the course of c. 27. With respect to the practice itself, the same opinion is expressed in Lactant. Inst. Div. IV. 20, *Non possunt innocentes existimari, qui viscera sua in prædam canibus objiciunt, et, quantum in ipsis est, crudelius necant, quam si strangulassent. Tam igitur nefarium est exponere quam necare.*

2. οὐκ ἐγαμοῦμεν, εἰ μὴ κ. τ. λ. See above, on c. 15, 18.

ἐγαμοῦμεν, εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ παίδων ἀνατροφῇ, ἢ παραιτούμενοι τὸ γήμασθαι τέλεον ἐνεγκρατευόμεθα. Καὶ ἤδη τις τῶν ἡμετέρων, ὑπὲρ τοῦ πεῖσαι ὑμᾶς ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν μυστήριον ἡ ἀνέδην μίξις, βιβλίδιον ἀνέδωκεν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ Φιλήκι ἡγεμονεύοντι, ἀξιῶν ἐπιτρέψαι ἰατρῷ τοὺς διδύμους αὐτοῦ ἀφελεῖν· ἄνευ γὰρ τῆς τοῦ ἡγεμόνος ἐπιτροπῆς τοῦτο πράττειν ἀπειρῆσθαι οἱ ἐκεῖ ἰατροὶ ἔλεγον. Καὶ μηδόλως βουληθέντος Φιλήκος ὑπογράψαι, ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ μείνας ὁ νεανίσκος ἠρκέσθη τῇ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν ὁμογνωμόνων συνειδήσει. Οὐκ ἄτοπον δὲ ἐπιμνησθῆναι ἐν τούτοις ἡγησάμεθα καὶ Ἀντινόου τοῦ νῦν γεγενημένου, ὃν καὶ πάντες ὡς θεὸν διὰ φόβου σέβειν ὥρμηντο, ἐπιστάμενοί τίς τε ἦν καὶ πόθεν ὑπῆρχεν.

In proving his second position, that *Jesus Christ is the true incarnate Son of God*, Justin rests his evidence upon *Prophecy* rather than *Miracles*, because these last might possibly be ascribed to Magic.

XXX. Ὅπως δὲ μή τις ἀντιτιθεὶς ἡμῖν, τί κωλύει καὶ τὸν παρ ἡμῖν λεγόμενον Χριστὸν, ἄνθρωπον ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ὄντα, μαγικῇ τέχνῃ ἃς λέγομεν δυνάμεις πεποιηκέναι, καὶ

4. τις τῶν ἡμετέρων κ. τ. λ. A similar story is related of Origen in Euseb. H. E. IV. 8. For a correct view of the motives for conduct so extraordinary, see Bishop Kaye's Justin, c. 6, p. 119.

7. Φήλικι. There can be little doubt that this is the correct reading. The MSS. however exhibit, and most Edd. retain, Φίληκι.

9. τοῦτο πράττειν ἀπειρῆσθαι. See Euseb. Chron. ad A. D. 84; Sueton. in Domit. c. 7; Martial. Epigr. VI.

13. τοῦ νῦν γεγενημένου. *Who was alive but lately.* The infamous history of this Antinous, and the divine honours paid to him after his death by order of the Emperor Adrian, were sadly notorious at the time, and are frequently denounced with just indignation by the early Christian writers. There are some little variations in the accounts; but those who would know τίς τε ἦν καὶ πόθεν ὑπῆρχεν, will find the information in Dio Cass. LXIX. 11; Aurel. Vict. 14; Spartian. V. Adrian. c. 14; Tatian. Orat. c. Græc. c. 10; Theoph. ad Autol. III. 8; Tertull. Apol. c. 13; Origen. c. Cels. III. 36; Prudent. adv. Symm. II. 271; Jerom. in Esai. II. 6; Niceph. III. 26, X. 36. This brief notice by Justin is cited in Euseb. H. E. IV. 8, with the following variations: ἡγούμεθα, γενομένου, ἅπαντες, φόβον.

14. δία φόβου. *Scil.* Ἀδριανοῦ. Spartian. l. c. *Volente Adriano eum consecraverunt.*

XXX. 1. μή τις ἀντιτιθεὶς ἡμῖν. Either the true reading is ἀντιτιθείη, as Davies supposes; or λέγῃ is understood.

2. παρ' ἡμῖν κ. τ. λ. *Erunt fortasse qui legendum putent* ὑμῖν......λέγετε. THIRLBY. *Nos nihil mutamus. Cyril. adv. Julian. X. t.* IV. *p. 345, ed. Aubert.* μὴ καταιτιάσθω λέγων, διὰ τί μὴ προσάγομεν ἱερεῖα βωμοῖς. *Similiter non raro alii.* OTTO.

3. μαγικῇ τέχνῃ. The Fathers in general, and Justin among the rest, never questioned the possibility of engaging the assistance of dæmons in the production

δόξαι διὰ τοῦτο υἱὸν Θεοῦ εἶναι, τὴν ἀπόδειξιν ἤδη ποιησόμεθα, οὐ τοῖς λέγουσι πιστεύοντες, ἀλλὰ τοῖς προφητεύουσι, πρὶν ἢ γενέσθαι, κατ' ἀνάγκην πειθόμενοι, διὰ τὸ καὶ ὄψει ὡς προεφητεύθη ὁρᾷν γενόμενα καὶ γινόμενα· ἥπερ μεγίστη καὶ ἀληθεστάτη ἀπόδειξις καὶ ὑμῖν, ὡς νομίζομεν, φανήσεται.

XXXI. Ἄνθρωποι οὖν τινες ἐν Ἰουδαίοις γεγένηνται Θεοῦ προφῆται, δι' ὧν τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα προεκήρυξε τὰ γενήσεσθαι μέλλοντα, πρὶν ἢ γενέσθαι· καὶ τούτων οἱ ἐν Ἰουδαίοις κατὰ καιροὺς γενόμενοι βασιλεῖς τὰς προφητείας, ὡς ἐλέχθησαν ὅτε προεφητεύοντο, τῇ ἰδίᾳ αὐτῶν Ἑβραΐδι φωνῇ ἐν βιβλίοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν τῶν προφητῶν συντεταγμένας κτώμενοι περιεῖπον. Ὅτε δὲ Πτολεμαῖος ὁ

Before proceeding, however, to quote from the prophecies, which were delivered many centuries before the predicted events took place, and foretold all the circumstances of Christ's life and death, and resurrection, together with the progress of his religion, he gives an account of the LXX version of the Scriptures, in which, as well as in the Hebrew original, they are preserved.

of extraordinary effects; and therefore, in their arguments both with Jews and Pagans, the evidence from prophecy was commonly alleged as the main bulwark of the truth of the Gospel. By the Jews, who during his residence among them affirmed that *he cast out devils through Beelzebub*, he was always regarded as a clever impostor: while the heathen contrasted his mighty works with the lying wonders of Simon, Apollonius, and others. See Dial. Tryph. c. 69; Clement. Recogn. I. 58; Arnob. adv. Gent. I. 43; Origen. c. Cels. I. 6, 38, 68; III. 26, 31; Jerom. in Ps. lxxxi. Therefore, even in slightly touching upon miraculous evidence, its value was made essentially to depend upon the fact, that Christ's supernatural performances had been the subject of prophecy. Thus, Iren. Hær. II. 57, εἰ δὲ καὶ τὸν Κύριον φαντασιωδῶς τὰ τοιαῦτα πεποιηκέναι φήσουσιν, ἐπὶ τὰ προφητικὰ ἀνάγοντες αὐτοὺς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐπιδείξομεν πάντα οὕτως περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ προειρῆσθαι, καὶ γεγονέναι βεβαίως, καὶ αὐτὸν μόνον εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ. Tertull. Apol. c. 21, *Primores Judæorum ita exasperabantur, ut postremo oblatum Pontio Pilato in crucem dedi sibi extorserint. Prodixerat et ipse ita futuros: parum hoc, si non et prophetæ retro.* Lactant. Inst. Div. v. 3, *Disce igitur non solum idcirco a nobis Deum creditum Christum quia mirabilia fecit, verum etiam quia videmus in eo facta esse omnia quæ nobis adnuntiata sunt vaticinio prophetarum. Fecit mirabilia: magum putassemus, ut et vos nunc putatis, et Judæi tunc putaverunt, si non illa ipsa facturum Christum prophetæ omnes uno spiritu prædicassent.* See also Tertul. Apol. c. 20; Origen. c. Cels. II. 48; Lactant. Inst. Div. IV. 13; Hilar. Comm. in Matt. can. 3.

5. τοῖς προφητεύουσι. Cod. Clar. προφητεύσασι. The margin, however, exhibits the common reading.

8. ἥπερ μεγίστη κ. τ. λ. Compare Apol. I. cc. 12, 32, 53; Dial. Tryph. cc. 7, 53, 76; Origen. c. Cels. I. 2, 49; II. 28; Euseb. Pr. Evang. III. 1 sqq. See also 2 Pet. i. 18.

XXXI. 7. κτώμενοι περιεῖπον. *Carefully preserved in their possession.* The verb περιέπειν signifies *to regard with affection, to cherish.* Xen. Cyr. IV. 4, 12, ἂν δέ τις ὑμῶν καὶ ἰὼν ὡς ἡμᾶς εὐνοϊκῶς καὶ πράττων τι καὶ διδάσκων φαίνηται, τοῦτον ἡμεῖς ὡς εὐεργέτην καὶ φίλον, οὐχ ὡς δοῦλον, περιέψομεν. For συντεταγμένας, Thirlby, without advocating a change, supposes that συντεταγμένοις may possibly be the true reading; but, in fact, the text is preferable as it stands.

Αἰγυπτίων βασιλεὺς βιβλιοθήκην κατεσκεύαζε, καὶ τὰ πάντων ἀνθρώπων συγγράμματα συνάγειν ἐπειράθη, πυθόμενος καὶ περὶ τῶν προφητειῶν τούτων, προσέπεμψε τῷ τῶν Ἰουδαίων τότε βασιλεύοντι Ἡρώδῃ, ἀξιῶν διαπεμφθῆναι αὐτῷ τὰς βίβλους τῶν προφητειῶν. Καὶ ὁ μὲν βασιλεὺς

8. *κατεσκεύαζε.* Ed. Morell. *κατεσκεύασε.* The sense, however, requires the imperfect, which is the reading of the MSS.

11. *βασιλεύοντι Ἡρώδῃ.* From the frequent inaccuracies of Justin in matters of chronology and history, this manifest anachronism, which makes a king of the Herodian family contemporary with the Egyptian Ptolemies, may fairly be attributed to a blunder of his own, though some of the commentators have endeavoured to shift it upon his transcribers. It was Eleazar, high-priest of the Jews, to whom Ptolemy applied for a copy of the Hebrew Scriptures: and therefore since Philo (Vit. Mos. II. 6) says that Eleazar was both high-priest and king; and, according to Josephus (Ant. XI. 4, 8), the sovereign power was vested in the Pontificate, until the accession of the Asmonæan princes; Grabe would read *ἱερεῖ* for *Ἡρώδῃ*, making a similar alteration in the following sentence. Pearson, Thalemann, and others regard *Ἡρώδῃ* as the marginal gloss of an ignorant copyist; and Usher imagines that Justin has confused the account of the foundation of the library with that of its restoration by Cleopatra.

11. *ἀξιῶν διαπεμφθῆναι κ. τ. λ.* In the Cohort. ad Græc. c. 13, Justin has given a fuller and somewhat different account of the LXX version of the Old Testament; which he has confessedly built upon the extraordinary narratives of Philo (*ubi supra*) and Josephus (Ant. XII. 2). The accounts of other Fathers are equally involved in a labyrinth of fabulous obscurity; and from the discrepancy which each of them exhibits, no reliance whatever can be placed upon them. See Iren. Hær. III. 25; Tertul. Apol. c. 18; Clem. Alex. Strom. I. 22, 148; Cyril. Catech. VI. 14; Hilar. En. in Ps. II.; Euseb. Præp. Evang. VIII. 1; Epiphan. de Pond. et Mens. cc. 3 sqq.; Augustin. Civ. D. XVIII. 42; De Doctr. Chr. II. 15. From a due consideration of the subject in all its bearings, it may fairly be presumed that the version was undertaken during the joint reign of Ptolemy Lagus and his son Philadelphus, about B.C. 285, for the use of the Jews then resident in Alexandria. The Pentateuch was first translated; then the book of Proverbs; and the rest of the books followed at somewhat distant intervals: and it is manifest from the difference of style, and the varying merit of the translation, that several hands contributed to the work. That the translators were natives of Egypt, is proved by the frequent introduction of Coptic words, and the Egyptian turn which is constantly given to Hebrew ideas and expressions. It is well known that this version gradually acquired the highest authority, not only among the Alexandrian Jews, but among the Hellenistic Jews of Palestine, and subsequently among Christians: nor is it unlikely that the legend of the direct inspiration of its framers was invented for the purpose of securing a degree of veneration which it might not otherwise command. Its intrinsic value however, more especially in the critical study of the New Testament, will be more duly appreciated from a consideration of the solemn sanction given to it by our Saviour and his Apostles, who very generally quoted from it; and, in conformity with their examples, it was employed

Ἡρώδης τῇ προειρημένῃ Ἑβραΐδι αὐτῶν φωνῇ γεγραμμένας διεπέμψατο. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ οὐκ ἦν γνώριμα τὰ ἐν αὐταῖς γεγραμμένα τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις, πάλιν αὐτὸν ἠξίωσε πέμψας τοὺς μεταβαλοῦντας αὐτὰς εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα φωνὴν ἀνθρώπους ἀποστεῖλαι. Καὶ τούτου γενομένου, ἔμειναν αἱ βίβλοι καὶ παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις μέχρι τοῦ δεῦρο, καὶ πανταχοῦ παρὰ πᾶσίν εἰσιν Ἰουδαίοις· οἳ καὶ ἀναγινώσκοντες οὐ συνιᾶσι τὰ εἰρημένα, ἀλλ' ἐχθροὺς ἡμᾶς καὶ πολεμίους ἡγοῦνται, ὁμοίως ὑμῖν ἀναιροῦντες καὶ κολάζοντες ἡμᾶς ὁπόταν δύνωνται, ὡς καὶ πεισθῆναι δύνασθε. Καὶ γὰρ ἐν τῷ νῦν γεγενημένῳ Ἰουδαϊκῷ πολέμῳ, Βαρχοχέβας, ὁ τῆς Ἰουδαίων

by the primitive Fathers of the Church. Justin evidently held it in the most devoted estimation; and, from his ignorance of Hebrew, was led to regard it as in all respects of equal authority with the original; observing, that in the counsels of the Divine Providence, the Jews, who hated the Christians because they did not understand their own Scriptures, were nevertheless the means of preserving both the one and the other. It was the text of the Septuagint to which Chrysostom and Theodoret applied their commentaries; and upon which were founded the expositions of Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzen, and Basil. Hence also was framed the Italic or Vulgate version, by Jerome: so that it was the Septuagint, either in Greek or Latin, that was "read, explained, and quoted as authority, for a period of 1500 years." The student, who would make himself master of the history of this celebrated translation, is referred to Walton's *Prolegomena;* Vossius *de LXX Interpp.;* Hody de Bibl. Text. Origen.; Prideaux's *Connexion*, Part II. bk. 1; Carpzovius *de Versione LXXvirali Græca;* and Horne's *Introduction*, vol. II. p. 39.

17. *ἔμειναν αἱ βίβλοι κ. τ. λ.* Joseph. Ant. XII. 2, *ἐκέλευσε (Πτολεμαῖος) πολλὴν ποιεῖσθαι τῶν βιβλίων τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν, ἵνα διαμείνῃ ταῦτα καθαρῶς.*

21. *ὁπόταν δύνωνται.* So Dial. Tryph. c. 16, *οὐ γὰρ ἐξουσίαν ἔχετε αὐτόχειρες γενέσθαι ἡμῶν διὰ τοὺς νῦν ἐπικρατοῦντας· ὁσάκις δ' ἂν ἐδυνήθητε, καὶ τοῦτο ἐπράξατε.* Again, in c. 95, *καὶ ἡμᾶς, τοὺς πιστεύοντας δι' αὐτοῦ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων, μισεῖτε καὶ φονεύετε, ὁσάκις ἂν λάβετε ἐξουσίαν.* Compare also c. 133. The hostility of the Jews against Christianity had never relaxed any of its bitterness. Various instances of it are recorded in the New Testament (Acts xiv. 2, 19, xvii. 5, 13; 1 Thess. ii. 14 sqq.); at the martyrdom of Polycarp it was exerted in all its malevolence (Epist. Smyrn. cc. 13, 17); and not only Justin, but the Fathers generally, make it the subject of frequent complaints. See Tertul. adv. Marc. III. 23; Adv. Jud. c. 13; Ad Nat. I. 14; Scorpiac. c. 10; Origen. c. Cels. VI. 27; Socrat. H. E. VII. 13; Sozom. H. E. II. 8, V. 22.

22. *ἐν τῷ νῦν γεγενημένῳ π.* *In the war which lately existed.* It was in the 17th year of Adrian's reign that Barchochebas succeeded in rousing the Jews into rebellion; for an account of which see Dio Cass. LXIX. 12 sqq.; Euseb. Hist. Eccl. IV. 6. Eusebius assigns the cause of his barbarian severity against the Christians to their refusal to take part in the insurrection; and in this opinion he is followed by Orosius (Hist. VII. 13): *Judæos perturbatione scelerum suorum exagitatos, et Palæstinam, provinciam quondam suam, depopulantes, ultima cæde*

ἀποστάσεως ἀρχηγέτης, Χριστιανοὺς μόνους εἰς τιμωρίας δεινάς, εἰ μὴ ἀρνοῖντο Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ βλασφημοῖεν, ἐκέλευεν ἀπάγεσθαι. Ἐν δὴ ταῖς τῶν προφητῶν βίβλοις εὕρομεν προκηρυσσόμενον παραγινόμενον, γεννώμενον διὰ παρθένου, καὶ ἀνδρούμενον, καὶ θεραπεύοντα πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν, καὶ νεκροὺς ἀνεγείροντα, καὶ φθονούμενον καὶ ἀγνοούμενον καὶ σταυρούμενον Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἡμέτερον Χριστόν, καὶ ἀποθνήσκοντα, καὶ ἀνεγειρόμενον, καὶ εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνερχόμενον, καὶ υἱὸν Θεοῦ ὄντα καὶ κεκλημένον, καί τινας πεμπομένους ὑπ' αὐτοῦ εἰς πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων κηρύξοντας ταῦτα, καὶ τοὺς ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἀνθρώπους μᾶλλον αὐτῷ πιστεύειν. Προεφητεύθη δέ, πρὶν ἢ φανῆναι αὐτόν, ἔτεσι ποτὲ μὲν πεντακισχιλίοις, ποτὲ δὲ τρισχιλίοις,

perdomuit Hadrianus, *ultusque est Christianos, quos illi Chocheba duce, quod sibi adversos Romanos non adsentarentur, excruciabant.* Clearly then νῦν must be understood in the somewhat enlarged sense of τὸ καθ' ἡμᾶς, both here, and in the allusion to the same insurrection in Dial. Tryph. c. 1. Compare c. 10. Thus also in c. 29 *supra*, Ἀντινόου τοῦ νῦν γεγενημένου. See Vales. ad Euseb. l. c. It should be mentioned, that in the text of Eusebius, who quotes the passage, the variations γενομένῳ, Βαρχωχέβας, and ἄγεσθαι, occur.

25. εἰ μὴ ἀρνοῖντο Ἰ. τὸν Χ. καὶ βλ. Compare Acts xxvi. 11; 1 Tim. i. 13; Epist. Smyrn. ap. Euseb. H. E. IV. 15; Tertull. Scorpiac. c. 9; Plin. Epist. x. 97.

36. ἔτεσι ποτὲ μὲν πεντακισχιλίοις, κ. τ. λ. If it were a necessary inference from the next chapter, that Justin regarded Moses as the *first of the Prophets* in the strict sense of the words, Bishop Pearson might well call it a *mira Chronologia* which places the Jewish legislator 5000 years before the birth of Christ. He should seem however to have meant, that Moses was the first who recorded the prophecies of earlier times, for the prediction cited is that of the dying Jacob; and on the supposition that *Adam*, or even, as some suppose, *Enoch*, was the first prophet, his date of the earliest prediction cannot perhaps be questioned. According to the vulgar chronology, indeed, the interval between Adam and Christ was only 4000 years; but the inaccuracy of this computation is now very generally admitted: and Justin may be supposed to have agreed with Theophilus (ad Autol. III.), who places the Creation 5515 years before Christ, and with Clement of Alexandria (Strom. I.), who considers the names which Adam gave to Eve and the brute creation as prophetic. By the prophecies delivered 3000 years B.C., those of Noah, whom Theophilus places at A.M. 2322, may be meant; Moses will synchronize with those given about 2000 B.C.; and the prophets of Judah and Israel with the periods from 1000 to 800 years B.C. If, however, Justin meant to say that the last prophet, Malachi, flourished 800 years before Christ, he differs about 400 years from the common calculation: and it is remarkable that there is a similar difference in the date which he elsewhere assigns (c. 42) to the epoch of David, whom he places 1500 years B.C. At the same time it is by no means certain that his words are to be so interpreted.

ποτὲ δὲ δισχιλίοις, καὶ πάλιν χιλίοις, καὶ ἄλλοτε ὀκτακοσίοις· κατὰ γὰρ τὰς διαδοχὰς τῶν γενῶν ἕτεροι καὶ ἕτεροι ἐγένοντο προφῆται.

Prophecies of Jacob and Isaiah concerning the Advent of Christ.

XXXII. Μωσῆς μὲν οὖν, πρῶτος τῶν προφητῶν γενόμενος, εἶπεν αὐτολεξεὶ οὕτως· Οὐκ ἐκλείψει ἄρχων ἐξ Ἰούδα, οὐδὲ ἡγούμενος ἐκ τῶν μηρῶν αὐτοῦ, ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ ᾧ ἀπόκειται· καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται προσδοκία ἐθνῶν, δεσμεύων πρὸς ἄμπελον τὸν πῶλον αὐτοῦ, πλύνων ἐν αἵματι σταφυλῆς τὴν στολὴν αὐτοῦ. Ὑμέτερον οὖν ἐστὶν ἀκριβῶς ἐξετάσαι καὶ μαθεῖν, μέχρι τίνος ἦν ἄρχων καὶ βασιλεὺς ἐν Ἰουδαίοις ἴδιος αὐτῶν. Μέχρι τῆς φανερώσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ ἡμετέρου διδασκάλου, καὶ τῶν ἀγνοουμένων προφητειῶν ἐξηγητοῦ, ὡς προεῤῥέθη ὑπὸ τοῦ θείου ἁγίου προφητικοῦ πνεύματος διὰ τοῦ Μωσέως, μὴ ἐκλείψειν ἄρχοντα ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων, ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ ᾧ ἀπόκειται τὸ βασίλειον. Ἰούδας γὰρ προπάτωρ Ἰουδαίων, ἀφ᾽ οὗ καὶ τὸ Ἰουδαῖοι καλεῖσθαι ἐσχήκασι· καὶ ὑμεῖς μετὰ τὴν γενομένην αὐτοῦ φανέρωσιν καὶ Ἰουδαίων ἐβασιλεύσατε, καὶ τῆς ἐκείνων πάσης γῆς ἐκρατήσατε. Τὸ δὲ, Αὐτὸς ἔσται προσδοκία ἐθνῶν, μηνυτικὸν ἦν ὅτι ἐκ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν προσδοκήσουσιν αὐτὸν πάλιν παραγενησό-

38. κατὰ τὰς διαδοχὰς τῶν γ. So in c. 32, κατὰ γένους διαδοχήν. Thirlby, however, would read γενεῶν.

XXXII. 1. πρῶτος. See the note on c. 31, 36. It should be observed, however, that Grabe understands πρῶτος in the sense of *princeps*, not *primus*; referring to Numb. xii. 6 sqq.

3. ᾧ ἀπόκειται. Cod. Reg. and ed. Steph. Gr. Thirl. Thal. ὃ ἀπόκειται. Cod. Clar. τὸ ἀπόκειται. In Gen. xlix. 10 sq., whence the prediction of the Patriarch is cited, the LXX Intt. have τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ. Justin, however, in Dial. Tryph. c. 120, maintains that this reading had been introduced by the Jews, who had contrived to displace the words ᾧ ἀπόκειται, by which the Hebrew had been originally rendered: whereas Julian, on the other hand, accused the Christians of doing precisely the reverse. See Cyrill. Alex. VIII. p. 253. Hence there can be no question that the Benedictine and subsequent editors have correctly restored ᾧ ἀποκεῖται to the text; which is also confirmed by Iren. Hær. IV. 23; Origen. Philocal. c. 1; Novat. de Trin. c. 9; Constt. Apost. VI. 11, 23; and the version of Symmachus quoted in Euseb. Pr. Ev. VIII. 1. Moreover, independently of these considerations, the expository clause, ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ ᾧ ἀπόκειται τὸ βασίλειον, which occurs a few lines onward, is alone sufficient to determine the question.

17. πάλιν παραγενησόμενον. Augustin. Civ. D. XVIII. 47, *Nam prior ejus adventus nondum erat desideratus omnibus gentibus: non enim quem debebant desiderare sciebant, in quem non crediderant.* By many, however, both in ancient and modern times, the prediction is understood to relate to our Lord's first advent; but such points it is obviously necessary to leave with the Biblical commentators.

μενον· ὅπερ ὄψει ὑμῖν πάρεστιν ἰδεῖν, καὶ ἔργῳ πεισθῆναι. Ἐκ πάντων γὰρ γενῶν ἀνθρώπων προσδοκῶσι τὸν ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ σταυρωθέντα, μεθ' ὃν εὐθὺς δοριάλωτος ὑμῖν ἡ γῆ Ἰουδαίων παρεδόθη. Τὸ δὲ, Δεσμεύων πρὸς ἄμπελον τὸν πῶλον αὐτοῦ, καὶ πλύνων τὴν στολὴν αὐτοῦ ἐν αἵματι σταφυλῆς, σύμβολον δηλωτικὸν ἦν τῶν γενησομένων τῷ Χριστῷ, καὶ τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ πραχθησομένων. Πῶλος γάρ τις ὄνου εἱστήκει ἔν τινι εἰσόδῳ κώμης προς ἄμπελον δεδεμένος, ὃν ἐκέλευσεν ἀγαγεῖν αὐτῷ τότε τοὺς γνωρίμους αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀχθέντος ἐπιβὰς ἐκάθισε, καὶ εἰσελήλυθεν εἰς τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα, ἔνθα τὸ μέγιστον ἱερὸν ἦν Ἰουδαίων, ὃ ὑφ' ὑμῶν ὕστερον κατεστράφη. Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐσταυρώθη, ὅπως τὸ λεῖπον τῆς προφητείας συντελεσθῇ. Τὸ γὰρ, Πλύνων τὴν στολὴν αὐτοῦ ἐν αἵματι σταφυλῆς, προαγγελτικὸν ἦν τοῦ πάθους οὗ πάσχειν ἔμελλε, δι' αἵματος καθαίρων τοὺς πιστεύοντας αὐτῷ. Ἡ γὰρ κεκλημένη ὑπὸ τοῦ θείου πνεύματος διὰ τοῦ προφήτου στολὴ, οἱ πιστεύοντες αὐτῷ εἰσιν ἄνθρωποι, ἐν οἷς οἰκεῖ τὸ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ σπέρμα, ὁ λόγος. Τὸ δὲ εἰρημένον αἷμα τῆς σταφυλῆς σημαντικὸν τοῦ ἔχειν μὲν αἷμα τὸν φανησόμενον, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρω-

20. *μεθ' ὅν. Scil. σταυρωθέντα. After he was crucified.*

25. *πρὸς ἄμπελον δεδεμένος.* In the Gospel narratives of Christ's entry into Jerusalem (Matt. xxi. 2; Mark xi. 2; Luke xix. 30), there is no mention of this circumstance, which Justin must therefore have learnt from tradition. The prophecy is similarly explained in Dial. Tryph. c. 53, with the additional remark that, in ordering the ass to be brought with the foal, our Lord intimated that Gentiles as well as Jews were to be admitted into the Christian covenant. Compare cc. 16, 95, 133.

30. *λεῖπον.* Grabe, Thalemann, and Braunius would read *λοιπόν*. The emendation is at least unnecessary.

31. *προαγγ. ἦν τοῦ πάθους κ. τ. λ.* Theodorit. Dial. I., *Illud* lavat in vino stolam suam *significat lavaturum in sanguine proprio corpus suum, amictum et pallium* (*περιβολὴν*) *Deitatis.*

35. *τὸ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ σπέρμα.* Compare 1 John iii. 9. Grabe would here read *πνεῦμα*, both as being in better keeping with the verb *οἰκεῖ*, and with a passage which he considers parallel in c. 33, *τὸ πνεῦμα οὖν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐδὲν ἄλλο νοῆσαι θέμις, ἢ τὸν λόγον.* There is, however, no need of any change; for the text, as it stands, is in perfect unison with the notions expressed by Justin in other places. Compare Apol. II. cc. 8, 13; Dial. Tryph. c. 61. A similar opinion is also advanced in Tertull. adv. Prax. c. 9, *Pater enim tota substantia est, filius vero derivatio totius et portio.* Compare Apol. c. 21. See, moreover, the note on the passage above cited from c. 33.

πείου σπέρματος, ἀλλ' ἐκ θείας δυνάμεως. Ἡ δὲ πρώτη δύναμις μετὰ τὸν πατέρα πάντων καὶ δεσπότην Θεὸν, καὶ υἱὸς ὁ λόγος ἐστίν· ὃς τίνα τρόπον σαρκοποιηθεὶς ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν, ἐν τοῖς ἑξῆς ἐροῦμεν. Ὃν τρόπον γὰρ τὸ τῆς ἀμπέλου αἷμα οὐκ ἄνθρωπος πεποίηκεν, ἀλλ' ὁ Θεὸς, οὕτως καὶ τοῦτο ἐμηνύετο οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρωπείου σπέρματος γενήσεσθαι τὸ αἷμα, ἀλλ' ἐκ δυνάμεως Θεοῦ, ὡς προέφημεν. Καὶ Ἡσαΐας δὲ ἄλλος προφήτης, τὰ αὐτὰ δι' ἄλλων ῥήσεων προφητεύων, οὕτως εἶπεν· Ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακὼβ, καὶ ἄνθος ἀναβήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς ῥίζης Ἰεσσαί· καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν βραχίονα αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν. Ἄστρον δὲ φωτεινὸν ἀνέτειλε, καὶ ἄνθος ἀνέβη ἀπὸ τῆς ῥίζης Ἰεσσαί, οὗτος ὁ Χριστός. Διὰ γὰρ παρθένου τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος Ἰακὼβ, τοῦ γενομένου πατρὸς Ἰούδα, τοῦ δεδηλωμένου Ἰουδαίων πατρὸς, διὰ δυνάμεως Θεοῦ ἀπεκυήθη· καὶ Ἰεσσαὶ προπάτωρ μὲν κατὰ τὸ λόγιον γεγένηται· τοῦ δὲ Ἰακὼβ καὶ τοῦ Ἰούδα κατὰ γένους διαδοχὴν υἱὸς ὑπῆρχεν.

The Incarnation of Christ, as foretold by Isaiah, contrasted with Pagan fiction.

XXXIII. Καὶ πάλιν ὡς αὐτολεξεὶ διὰ παρθένου μὲν τεχθησόμενος διὰ τοῦ Ἡσαΐου προεφητεύθη, ἀκούσατε. Ἐλέχθη δὲ οὕτως· Ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει, καὶ τέξεται υἱόν· καὶ ἐροῦσιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ, Μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός. Ἃ γὰρ ἦν ἄπιστα καὶ ἀδύνατα νομιζόμενα παρὰ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις γενήσεσθαι, ταῦτα ὁ Θεὸς προεμήνυσε διὰ τοῦ προφητικοῦ πνεύματος μέλλειν γίνεσθαι, ἵν', ὅταν

43. *τοῦτο ἐμηνύετο κ. τ. λ.* Thirlby would read *τούτου*. An emendation, says the Benedictine editor, *satis apta, sed minime necessaria.*

46. *ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον κ. τ. λ.* Although Justin is generally more exact in his quotations from the Old Testament than from the New, many instances of inaccuracy may still be laid to his charge. Here he has plainly united the prophecy of Balaam (Numb. xxiv. 17) with Isai. xi. 1, 10. Compare Isai. li. 5. Other examples of a like character will be noticed as they occur. See also Bishop Kaye's Justin, pp. 139 sqq.—For *ἐπὶ τὸν βραχίονα*, the LXX has simply *ἐπ' αὐτῷ*, as cited in Rom. xv. 12.

52. *προπάτωρ*. *Scil.* Χριστοῦ. In the next clause there is a change of person, and Χριστὸς must be supplied.

XXXIII. 3. *ἰδοὺ, ἡ παρθένος κ. τ. λ.* This prophecy is from Isai. vii. 14. Justin seems to have confused the latter part of it with Matt. i. 23. He enters at large into an explanation of it in different parts of the Dial. Tryph. See cc. 43, 66, 77, 84; and compare Iren. Hær. III. 24 sqq.; Tertull. c. Marc. III. 13; Adv. Jud. c. 9.

7. *ἵν', ὅταν γένηται, κ. τ. λ.* John xiv. 29, *νῦν εἴρηκα ὑμῖν πρὶν γενέσθαι, ἵνα, ὅταν γένηται, πιστεύσητε.* Compare Dial. Tryph. c. 84.

γένηται, μὴ ἀπιστηθῇ, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ προειρῆσθαι πιστευθῇ. Ὅπως δέ μή τινες, μὴ νοήσαντες τὴν δεδηλωμένην προφητείαν, ἐγκαλέσωσιν ἡμῖν ἅπερ ἐνεκαλέσαμεν τοῖς ποιηταῖς εἰποῦσιν ἀφροδισίων χάριν ἐληλυθέναι ἐπὶ γυναῖκας τὸν Δία, διασαφῆσαι τοὺς λόγους πειρασώμεθα. Τὸ οὖν, Ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει, σημαίνει οὐ συνουσιασθεῖσαν τὴν παρθένον συλλαβεῖν. Εἰ γὰρ ἐσυνουσιάσθη ὑπὸ ὁτουοῦν, οὐκ ἔτι ἦν παρθένος· ἀλλὰ δύναμις Θεοῦ ἐπελθοῦσα τῇ παρθένῳ ἐπεσκίασεν αὐτήν, καὶ κυοφορῆσαι παρθένον οὖσαν πεποίηκε. Καὶ ὁ ἀποσταλεὶς δὲ πρὸς αὐτὴν τὴν παρθένον κατ' ἐκεῖνο τοῦ καιροῦ ἄγγελος Θεοῦ εὐηγγελίσατο αὐτήν, εἰπών, Ἰδοὺ συλλήψῃ ἐν γαστρὶ ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου, καὶ τέξῃ υἱόν, καὶ υἱὸς ὑψίστου κληθήσεται, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν· αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν,—ὡς οἱ ἀπομνημονεύσαντες πάντα τὰ περὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐδίδαξαν· οἷς ἐπιστεύσαμεν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προδεδηλωμένου τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα τοῦτον γενησόμενον, ὡς προεμηνύομεν,

9. ὅπως δέ μή τινες, μὴ ν. The MSS. and most edd. omit the first μή, which is manifestly essential to the sense, as all the editors have perceived, though Otto alone has inserted it in the text. Some would read μήπως for ὅπως, as previously in c. 3, 44; and others insert the second μὴ before ἐγκαλέσωσιν. Since, however, the error most probably arose from the repetition of the adverb in close connexion, the emendation of Thirlby is preferable; and it is also confirmed by the like conjunction of particles in Apol. I. cc. 30, 43; II. c. 4; Dial. Tryph. c. 62; and elsewhere.

12. πειρασώμεθα. Sylburg considers πειρασόμεθα, in the indicative, more appropriate. Any change, however, in the face of the MSS., would be unjustifiable.

14. συλλαβεῖν. *Scil.* ἐν γαστρί. The ellipsis is supplied a few lines forward in the declaration of the Angel, Ἰδού, συλλήψῃ ἐν γαστρὶ κ. τ. λ., which is cited, either from an error of memory or by design, partly from Matt. i. 21, and partly from Luke i. 31, 33.

22. οἱ ἀπομνημονεύσαντες. In cc. 66, 67, of this Apology, and repeatedly in the Dialogue with Trypho (cc. 103, 107, &c.), Justin refers to certain Ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν Ἀποστόλων, or *Apostolical memoirs* of the life and teaching of Jesus Christ. Although it has been argued that by this term he did not intend to designate our present Gospels, it should seem that all doubts upon the subject have been now removed by the lucid and convincing examination of the question in Bishop Kaye's account of his Works, c. VIII. pp. 132 sqq. The conclusion at which the learned Prelate arrives, is, that Justin did not quote a narrative agreeing in substance only with our present Gospels, though differing in expression, but that he quoted those Gospels themselves *from memory*.

25. γενησόμενον. *Vulgo* γεννησόμενον, for which the Benedictine editor would

ἔφη. Τὸ πνεῦμα οὖν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐδὲν ἄλλο νοῆσαι θέμις, ἢ τὸν λόγον, ὃς καὶ πρωτότοκος τῷ Θεῷ ἐστι, ὡς Μωσῆς ὁ προδεδηλωμένος προφήτης ἐμήνυσε. Καὶ τοῦτο ἐλθὸν ἐπὶ τὴν παρθένον καὶ ἐπισκιάσαν, οὐ διὰ συνουσίας, ἀλλὰ διὰ δυνάμεως, ἐγκύμονα κατέστησε. Τὸ

either read γεννηθησόμενον, or, what is far preferable, emend the text, as above, by the removal of a single letter. For προεμηνύομεν, Cod. Clar. has προσμηνύομεν.

26. τὸ πνεῦμα οὖν κ. τ. λ. Here is plainly an allusion to the words of the Angel to Mary in Luke i. 35, πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπί σε, καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σε. Grotius however, on Mark ii. 8, adduces this passage of Justin, among many more from different writers, to prove that the words πνεῦμα and *spiritus* are frequently employed by the early Fathers to signify the *divine nature* in Christ. See also Bishop Bull's Defens. Fid. Nic. I. 2, 5. Thus Tertull. c. Marc. III. 16, *Spiritus Creatoris, qui est Christus.* In the present, and some other instances, however, the *Holy Spirit* and the *Logos* are in some degree confused, and indeed apparently identified; and in like manner, Justin attributes the inspiration of the Prophets sometimes to the Holy Ghost, and at others to the Prophets. Compare Apol. I. cc. 31, 36, 61; II. c. 10; Dial. Tryph. cc. 25, 32, 49, 52, 55, 61, 87, 141. Bishop Kaye (pp. 72, 73) explains the fact upon the supposition that, as the *Logos* was the conductor of the whole Gospel economy, Justin deemed it a matter of indifference whether he said that the Prophets were inspired by the *Logos* or by the Holy Spirit, who is called in Scripture the *Spirit of Christ.* See Rom. viii. 9; Gal. iv. 6; Phil. i. 19; 1 Pet. i. 11. In the last text the immediate reference is to the inspiration of the Prophets. With respect to the passage under consideration, the Bishop suggests that as, in the mystery of the Incarnation, the Holy Ghost came upon the Virgin, and the power of the Highest overshadowed her, and the Word thereby became flesh, the idea uppermost in the mind of the writer was, that the Holy Spirit, the power of the Highest, and the Logos, were the same: that they were, in fact, *the Trinity in Unity.* Certain it is, that Justin elsewhere assigns a *distinct personality* to the Holy Spirit. See above, cc. 6, 13. Be it observed in conclusion, that the words of the Angel are interpreted in the same manner by Tertullian (*Adv. Prax.* c. 26); who adds, *Johanne enim dicente,* Sermo caro factus est, *Spiritum quoque intelligimus in mentione* Sermonis; *ita et hic* Sermonem *quoque agnoscimus in nomine* Spiritus. *Nam et* Spiritus *substantia est* Sermonis, *et* Sermo *operatio* Spiritus, *et duo unum sunt.* Without adducing any of the numerous passages in which this Father speaks of the Spirit as a distinct person, it will be seen that he agrees with Justin as to the combined source of inspiration in the Prophets, by comparing Adv. Marc. III. 6; IV. 13; Præscr. Hær. c. 13; Resurr. Carn. c. 22; Adv. Hermog. c. 22; Adv. Prax. c. 11.

28. ὡς Μωσῆς. The MSS. and edd. omit ὡς, which Otto has properly inserted as requisite to the sense. Still, unless Justin alludes to the mystical interpretation of some such passage as Gen. i. 3, or Exod. iv. 22, Moses has said nothing like what is here attributed to him; neither is he the prophet to whom reference was last made. Hence Grabe, with great probability, conjectures that the copyist, having mistaken the words ὡς Ἡσ.—of which the latter was an abbreviation of ὡς Ἡσαΐας,—and prefixed to them the letter M, introduced a corruption into

δὲ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ὄνομα τῇ Ἑβραΐδι φωνῇ, σωτὴρ τῇ Ἑλληνίδι διαλέκτῳ δηλοῖ. Ὅθεν καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος πρὸς τὴν παρθένον εἶπε, Καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν, αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν. Ὅτι δὲ οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ θεοφοροῦνται οἱ προφητεύοντες, εἰ μὴ λόγῳ θείῳ, καὶ ὑμεῖς, ὡς ὑπολαμβάνω, φήσετε.

Micah's prophecy respecting the *place* of Christ's Nativity.

XXXIV. Ὅπου δὲ καὶ τῆς γῆς γεννᾶσθαι ἔμελλεν, ὡς προεῖπεν ἕτερος προφήτης ὁ Μιχαίας, ἀκούσατε. Ἔφη δὲ οὕτως· Καὶ σὺ Βηθλεέμ, γῆ Ἰούδα, οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα· ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ ἐξελεύσεται ἡγούμενος, ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου. Κώμη δέ τίς ἐστιν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ Ἰουδαίων, ἀπέχουσα σταδίους τριακονταπέντε Ἱεροσολύμων, ἐν ᾗ ἐγεννήθη Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, ὡς καὶ μαθεῖν δύνασθε ἐκ τῶν ἀπογραφῶν τῶν γενομένων ἐπὶ Κυρηνίου, τοῦ ὑμετέρου ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ πρώτου γενομένου ἐπιτρόπου.

Predictions relating to the *Crucifixion* of Christ, and his public entry into Jerusalem.

XXXV. Ὡς δὲ καὶ λήσειν ἔμελλε τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους γεννηθεὶς ὁ Χριστὸς ἄχρις ἀνδρωθῇ, ὅπερ καὶ γέγονεν, ἀκούσατε τῶν προειρημένων εἰς τοῦτο. Ἔστι δὲ ταῦτα·

the text. The conjecture is rendered even yet more probable, from the fact that Justin has given the same view of this prophecy of Isaiah in Dial. Tryph. c. 84.

31. Ἰησοῦς σωτὴρ δηλοῖ. Compare Apol. II. c. 6.

XXXIV. 3. καὶ σὺ Βηθλεέμ, κ. τ. λ. This prophecy of Micah (v. 2) is given precisely as it is quoted in Matt. ii. 6. See the Commentators *ad loc.*

7. ἐν ᾗ ἐγεννήθη. Dial. Tryph. c. 78, ἐν σπηλαίῳ τινὶ συνεγγὺς τῆς κώμης. Though it may be proper to indicate this circumstance, which is also mentioned by other Fathers, any remarks upon it would here be out of place.

8. ἐκ τῶν ἀπογραφῶν. *From the records of the taxing.* Such probably is the force of the plural. With respect to the enrolment itself, and the points of criticism and chronology which it involves, see the Commentators on Luke ii. 2. Of the title ἐπίτροπος, see above on c. 13, 15.

XXXV. 3. ἔστι δὲ ταῦτα. The prophecies, which are cited in this chapter, have no reference whatever to the privacy of our Lord's early life, but bear exclusively upon the events connected with his crucifixion. Grabe and others suppose therefore, that there is here a somewhat extensive *lacuna*, which, among other passages from the Prophets, may have contained that from Isai. xlii. 2, as cited in Matt. xii. 19. That prediction, however, is applied by the Evangelist to the manner in which Christ quietly withdrew himself from the vindictive malice of the Pharisees, and not to the unobtrusive obscurity in which he passed the time previous to the commencement of his ministry. At the same time, it is certain that Justin was very likely to have given a different turn to the prediction: and Braunius indeed maintains that his quotations are frequently so irrelevant, that there is no valid reason for supposing any omission whatsoever, since the MSS. exhibit not the slightest vestige of a break. The utter want of connexion is, however, so

Παιδίον ἐγεννήθη ἡμῖν, καὶ νεανίσκος ἡμῖν ἀπεδόθη, οὗ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων· μηνυτικὸν τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ σταυροῦ, ᾧ προσέθηκε τοὺς ὤμους σταυρωθείς, ὡς προϊόντος τοῦ λόγου σαφέστερον δειχθήσεται. Καὶ πάλιν ὁ αὐτὸς προφήτης Ἡσαΐας, θεοφορούμενος τῷ πνεύματι τῷ προφητικῷ, ἔφη· Ἐγὼ ἐξεπέτασα τὰς χεῖράς μου ἐπὶ λαὸν ἀπειθοῦντα καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα, ἐπὶ τοὺς πορευομένους ἐν ὁδῷ οὐ καλῇ. Αἰτοῦσί με νῦν κρίσιν, καὶ ἐγγίζειν Θεῷ τολμῶσιν. Καὶ πάλιν ἐν ἄλλοις λόγοις δι' ἑτέρου προφήτου λέγει· Αὐτοὶ ὤρυξάν μου πόδας καὶ χεῖρας, καὶ ἔβαλον κλῆρον ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου. Καὶ ὁ μὲν Δαβὶδ ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ προφήτης, ὁ εἰπὼν ταῦτα, οὐδὲν τούτων ἔπαθεν· Ἰησοῦς δὲ Χριστὸς ἐξετάθη τὰς χεῖρας, σταυρωθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀντιλεγόντων αὐτῷ καὶ φασκόντων μὴ εἶναι αὐτὸν Χριστόν. Καὶ γάρ, ὡς εἶπεν ὁ προφήτης, διασύροντες αὐτὸν ἐκάθισαν ἐπὶ βήματος, καὶ εἶπον, Κρῖνον ἡμῖν. Τὸ δέ, Ὤρυξάν μου χεῖρας καὶ πόδας, ἐξήγησις τῶν ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ παγέντων ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ καὶ τοῖς ποσὶν αὐτοῦ ἥλων ἦν. Καὶ μετὰ τὸ σταυρῶσαι αὐτόν, ἔβαλον κλῆρον ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐμερίσαντο ἑαυτοῖς οἱ σταυρώσαντες αὐτόν. Καὶ ταῦτα ὅτι γέγονε, δύνασθε μαθεῖν ἐκ τῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου γενο-

palpable, and the greatest ingenuity is so avowedly incapable of discovering any affinity between the prophecies cited and the fact they are said to prove, that something must surely have been obliterated from the earlier copies, of which subsequent transcribers have taken no pains to preserve an indication.

4. *παιδίον ἐγεννήθη κ. τ. λ.* From Isai. ix. 6.

5. *μηνυτικόν. Scil. ὅ ἐστι.* Stephens would read *μηνυτικῶν*, with reference to *προειρημένων*, in the beginning of the chapter; but this would surely be inadmissible, even if the supposition of an *hiatus* be unfounded. The student will probably be disposed to regard Justin's interpretation of this prophecy as somewhat fanciful.

9. *ἐγὼ ἐξεπέτασα κ. τ. λ.* From Isai. lxv. 2. The passage is quoted, with a different object, in Rom. x. 21.

11. *αἰτοῦσί με κ. τ. λ.* The clause, which seems to be cited as if in continuation of the preceding prophecy, is found in Isai. lviii. 2.

12. *αὐτοὶ ὤρυξαν κ. τ. λ.* Psalm xxi. 17, 19, (LXX).

18. *διασύροντες αὐτὸν κ. τ. λ.* There is no passage in the Gospels to which this is referable, unless it be to the mock salutation of Jesus as King of the Jews in Matt. xxvii. 29.

20. *ἐξήγησις τῶν ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ κ. τ. λ.* See Matt. xxvii. 35; John xx. 25.

24. *ἐκ τῶν ἐπὶ Π. Π. γ. ἄκτων.* Justin again appeals to these *Acts of Pilate* in c. 48. See also Tertul. Apol. cc. 5, 21; Euseb. Hist. Eccl. II. 2. There are

μένων ἄκτων. Καὶ ὅτι ῥητῶς καθεσθησομενος ἐπὶ πῶλον ὄνου, καὶ εἰσελευσόμενος εἰς τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα προεπεφήτευτο, ἑτέρου προφήτου τοῦ Σοφονίου τὰς τῆς προφητείας λέξεις ἐροῦμεν. Εἰσὶ δὲ αὗται· Χαῖρε σφόδρα θύγατερ Σιὼν, κήρυσσε θύγατερ Ἱερουσαλήμ· ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεύς σου ἔρχεταί σοι πρᾶος, ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὑποζυγίου.

In a digression extending through nine chapters, Justin lays down certain rules for the interpretation of prophecy.

XXXVI. Ὅταν δὲ τὰς λέξεις τῶν προφητῶν λεγομένας ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου ἀκούητε, μὴ ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἐμπεπνευσμένων λέγεσθαι νομίσητε, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ κινοῦντος αὐτοὺς θείου λόγου. Ποτὲ μὲν γὰρ ὡς προαγγελτικῶς τὰ μέλλοντα γενήσεσθαι λέγει, ποτὲ δ' ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ δεσπότου πάντων καὶ πατρὸς Θεοῦ φθέγγεται, ποτὲ δὲ ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ποτὲ δὲ ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου λαῶν ἀποκρινομένων τῷ κυρίῳ, ἢ τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ· ὁποῖον καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν παρ' ὑμῖν συγγραφέων ἰδεῖν ἔστιν, ἕνα μὲν τὸν τὰ πάντα συγγράφοντα ὄντα, πρόσωπα δὲ τὰ διαλεγόμενα

still extant a letter of Pilate to the Emperor Tiberius, and certain records of his government in Judæa; but they are unquestionably a spurious production, which subsequently induced the heathen adversaries of Christianity to forge others full of blasphemy and misrepresentation. Eusebius (H. E. I. 9, IX. 5) has fully exposed the falsehood of these last, which the Emperor Maximin ordered to be posted up in the provinces, and to be taught to children in order that they might be bred up with a hatred of the Gospel. It is probable that Pilate followed the usual practice of the Roman procurators in forwarding to the Emperor an account of his administration; just as Pliny (Epist. x. 97) informed Trajan of his proceedings against the Christians, and Caligula received *daily memoranda* (ἐφημερίδας ὑπομνηματικὰς) of what was passing in Alexandria. See Phil. Jud. Legat. ad C. The genuine *Acts of Pilate* were doubtless destroyed in consequence of the unanswerable appeals which the Christians frequently made to them, and their place supplied by the forgery now extant, which contains, however, records of both the circumstances to which Justin alludes. See Casaubon. ad Baron. Ann. XVI. 154, 221; Grot. de Verit. Rel. Chr. II. 2.

26. προεπεφήτευτο. *Vulgo* προεφήτευτο, which is not Greek. Thalemann's emendation has been admitted into the text, as in some respects preferable either to προεφητεύετο or προεφητεύθη, proposed by Thirlby.

27. τοῦ Σοφονίου. Quoting from memory, Justin has assigned to Zephaniah a prophecy which rightly belongs to Zechariah (ix. 9), and of which the latter part is given according to the citation of St. Matthew (xxi. 5), rather than the LXX version. In Dial. Tryph. c. 53, the same prediction is quoted in a very different form, and correctly attributed to Zechariah.

XXXVI. 1. λεγομένας ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου. *Spoken as it were personally*; i.e. in the person or character of the prophet himself.

3. κινοῦντος αὐτοὺς θείου λόγου. See Isai. ii. 1; Jer. i. 2, ii. 1; Ezek. i. 3; Luke iii. 2, and elsewhere.

παραφέροντα. Ὅπερ μὴ νοήσαντες οἱ ἔχοντες τὰς βίβλους τῶν προφητῶν Ἰουδαῖοι, οὐκ ἐγνώρισαν οὔτε παραγενόμενον τὸν Χριστόν· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμᾶς τοὺς λέγοντας παραγεγενῆσθαι αὐτὸν, καὶ ὡς προεκεκήρυκτο ἀποδεικνύντας ἐσταυρῶσθαι ὑπ' αὐτῶν, μισοῦσιν.

Prophecies delivered in the person of God the Father.

XXXVII. Ἵνα δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ὑμῖν φανερὸν γένηται, ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ πατρὸς ἐλέχθησαν διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προειρημένου προφήτου οἵδε οἱ λόγοι· Ἔγνω βοῦς τὸν κτησάμενον, καὶ ὄνος τὴν φάτνην τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ, Ἰσραὴλ δέ με οὐκ ἔγνω, καὶ ὁ λαός μου οὐ συνῆκεν. Οὐαὶ ἔθνος ἁμαρτωλὸν, λαὸς πλήρης ἁμαρτιῶν, σπέρμα πονηρὸν, υἱοὶ ἄνομοι, ἐγκατελίπετε τὸν κύριον. Καὶ πάλιν ἀλλαχοῦ, ὅταν λέγῃ ὁ αὐτὸς προφήτης ὁμοίως ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρός· Ποῖόν μοι οἶκον οἰκοδομήσετε; λέγει κύριος· ὁ οὐρανός μοι θρόνος, καὶ ἡ γῆ ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν μου. Καὶ πάλιν ἀλλαχοῦ· Τὰς νουμηνίας ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ σάββατα μισεῖ ἡ ψυχή μου, καὶ μεγάλην ἡμέραν νηστείας καὶ ἀργίαν οὐκ ἀνέχομαι· οὐδ', ἂν ἔρχησθε ὀφθῆναί μοι, εἰσακούσομαι ὑμῶν· πλήρεις αἵματος αἱ χεῖρες ὑμῶν· κἂν φέρητε σεμίδαλιν, θυμίαμα, βδέλυγμά μοί ἐστι· στέαρ ἀρνῶν καὶ αἷμα ταύρων οὐ βούλομαι. Τίς γὰρ ἐξεζήτησε ταῦτα ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ὑμῶν; Ἀλλὰ διάλυε παντα σύνδεσμον ἀδικίας, διάσπα στραγγαλιὰς βιαίων συναλλαγμάτων, ἄστεγον καὶ γυμνὸν σκέπε, διά-

11. παραφέροντα. *Introducing* or *bringing forward.* Compare Apol. I. c. 54; Dial. Tryph. c. 69. It has been proposed to read διαφέροντα in agreement with πρόσωπα, which is not only altogether unnecessary, but would yield both an unpleasant jingle and a harsh construction.

12. οὔτε παραγενόμενον. Thirlby has printed οὐδὲ, which is possibly correct; though ἤδη would be a preferable reading.

XXXVII. 2. τοῦ πατρός. That this is the true reading is abundantly manifest from the whole tenour of the discourse, from the words ὁμοίως ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς in the next sentence, and from the transition to prophecies delivered in the person *of the Son*, in the following chapter. It has been proposed, however, to read τοῦ υἱοῦ, in the idea that the prediction ἔγνω βοῦς κ. τ. λ., cited from Isai. i. 3, 4, alludes more immediately to the obstinate refusal of the Jews to receive Jesus as the Messiah. In the clause ὁ λαός μου οὐ συνῆκεν, Grabe would read με for μου, as the same words are again quoted in c. 63, and as they stand in the LXX.

8. ποῖόν μοι οἶκον κ. τ. λ. The clauses of this citation are transposed, and the same transposition is repeated in Dial. Tryph. c. 22. The words occur in Isai. lxvi. 1.

10. τὰς νουμηνίας κ. τ. λ. Cited from Isai. i. 11—15.

17. ἀλλὰ διάλυε κ. τ. λ. From Isai. lviii. 6, 7.

θρυπτε πεινῶντι τὸν ἄρτον σου. Ὁποῖα μὲν οὖν ἐστι καὶ τὰ διδασκόμενα διὰ τῶν προφητῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, νοεῖν δύνασθε.

Prophecies, in which *Christ* is the speaker.

XXXVIII. Ὅταν δὲ ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Χριστοῦ λέγῃ τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα, οὕτως φθέγγεται· Ἐγὼ ἐξεπέτασα τὰς χεῖράς μου ἐπὶ λαὸν ἀπειθοῦντα καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα, ἐπὶ τοὺς πορευομένους ἐν ὁδῷ οὐ καλῇ. Καὶ πάλιν· Τὸν νῶτόν μου τέθεικα εἰς μάστιγας καὶ τὰς σιαγόνας μου εἰς ῥαπίσματα, τὸ δὲ πρόσωπόν μου οὐκ ἀπέστρεψα ἀπὸ αἰσχύνης ἐμπτυσμάτων· καὶ ὁ κύριος βοηθός μου ἐγένετο. Διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐνετράπην, ἀλλ' ἔθηκα τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ὡς στερεὰν πέτραν, καὶ ἔγνων ὅτι οὐ μὴ αἰσχυνθῶ, ὅτι ἐγγίζει ὁ δικαιώσας με. Καὶ πάλιν ὅταν λέγῃ· Αὐτοὶ ἔβαλον κλῆρον ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου, καὶ ὤρυξάν μου πόδας καὶ χεῖρας. Ἐγὼ δὲ ἐκοιμήθην καὶ ὕπνωσα καὶ ἀνέστην· ὅτι κύριος ἀντελάβετό μου. Καὶ πάλιν ὅταν λέγῃ· Ἐλάλησαν ἐν χείλεσιν, ἐκίνησαν κεφαλήν, λέγοντες, Ῥυσάσθω ἑαυτόν. Ἅτινα πάντα ὡς γέγονεν ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων τῷ Χριστῷ, μαθεῖν δύνασθε. Σταυρωθέντος γὰρ αὐτοῦ, ἐξέστρεφον τὰ χείλη, καὶ ἐκίνουν τὰς κεφαλάς, λέγοντες, Ὁ νεκροὺς ἀνεγείρας ῥυσάσθω ἑαυτόν.

The manner in which the *Holy Spirit* speaks prophetically, illustrated in a prediction of Isaiah respecting the propagation of the Gospel.

XXXIX. Ὅταν δὲ ὡς προφητεῦον τὰ μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι λαλῇ τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα, οὕτως λέγει· Ἐκ γὰρ Σιὼν ἐξελεύσεται νόμος, καὶ λόγος κυρίου ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ κρινεῖ ἀνὰ μέσον ἐθνῶν, καὶ ἐλέγξει λαὸν πολύν· καὶ συγκόψουσι τὰς μαχαίρας αὐτῶν εἰς ἄροτρα, καὶ τὰς ζιβύνας αὐτῶν εἰς δρέπανα, καὶ οὐ μὴ λήψονται ἔθνος ἐπὶ ἔθνος μάχαιραν, καὶ οὐ μὴ μάθωσιν ἔτι πολεμεῖν. Καὶ ὅτι

20. ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. *Hoc est*, ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Θεοῦ. OTTO.

XXXVIII. 2. ἐγὼ ἐξεπέτασα κ. τ. λ. This text of Isaiah (lxv. 2) has been previously quoted in c. 35.

4. τὸν νῶτόν μου τέθεικα κ. τ. λ. From Isai. l. 6—8.

10. αὐτοὶ ἔβαλον κ. τ. λ. From Ps. xxii. 16, 18.

12. ἐγὼ δὲ ἐκοιμήθην κ. τ. λ. From Ps. iii. 5.

14. ἐλάλησαν ἐν χείλεσιν κ. τ. λ. From Ps. xxii. 8, 9.

15. ὡς γέγονεν κ. τ. λ. The particle ὡς is omitted in the MSS. and Edd. Since, however, almost all the Commentators acknowledge either its insertion to be necessary, or that γεγονέναι should be substituted for γέγονεν, the former remedy has been adopted as perhaps on the whole more in Justin's manner. Thirlby's suggestion, ἃ ὅτι, for ἅτινα, is less probable.

16. σταυρωθέντος γὰρ κ. τ. λ. Compare Matt. xxvii. 39, 43.

XXXIX. 2. ἐκ γὰρ Σιὼν κ. τ. λ. From Isai. ii. 3, 4.

οὕτως γέγονε, πεισθῆναι δύνασθε. Ἀπὸ γὰρ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἄνδρες δεκαδύο τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸν κόσμον, καὶ οὗτοι ἰδιῶται, λαλεῖν μὴ δυνάμενοι· διὰ δὲ Θεοῦ δυνάμεως ἐμήνυσαν παντὶ γένει ἀνθρώπων, ὡς ἀπεστάλησαν ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ διδάξαι πάντας τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον, καὶ οἱ πάλαι ἀλληλοφόνται οὐ μόνον οὐ πολεμοῦμεν τοὺς ἐχθροὺς, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τοῦ μηδὲ ψεύδεσθαι, μηδ' ἐξαπατῆσαι τοὺς ἐξετάζοντας, ἡδέως, ὁμολογοῦντες τὸν Χριστὸν, ἀποθνήσκομεν. Δυνατὸν γὰρ ἦν τὸ λεγόμενον,

Ἡ γλῶσσ' ὀμώμοκεν, ἡ δὲ φρὴν ἀνώμοτος,

ποιεῖν ἡμᾶς εἰς τοῦτο. Γελοῖον ἢ δὴ πρᾶγμα, ὑμῖν μὲν τοὺς συντιθεμένους καὶ καταλεγομένους στρατιώτας καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἑαυτῶν ζωῆς, καὶ γονέων, καὶ πατρίδος, καὶ πάντων τῶν οἰκείων, τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀσπάζεσθαι ὁμολογίαν, μηδὲν

8. *πεισθῆναι.* Thirlby reads *μαθεῖν* without any MSS. authority, and without any very obvious reason.

— *ἀπὸ γὰρ Ἱερουσαλὴμ κ. τ. λ.* Tertull. c. Marcion. III. 22, *Circumferentes legem ex Sion profectam, et Sermonem Domini ex Hierusalem, ut fieret quod scriptum est.* The evidence in favour of Christianity derived from its successful propagation by men naturally incompetent to the task, either in respect of influence or acquirements, is frequently urged by the primitive writers. See Euseb. Dem. Ev. III. 8; De Laud. Const. c. 17; Origen. c. Cels. III.; De Princip. IV. 1; Philocal. c. 4; Chrysostom. Hom. in Matt. xxiv.; in 1 Johan. i.; in 1 Cor. iii.; August. Civ. D. xxii. 5; De Ver. Rel. c. 3. The word *ἰδιώτης* does not, like the word derived from it in our language, imply *deficiency of intellect*, but simply denotes a person of *ordinary capacity;* as in Acts. iv. 13; 2 Cor. xi. 6. Thus Xen. de Venat., *ἐγὼ δὲ ἰδιώτης μέν εἰμι.* The Scholiast on Aristophanes (Ran. 830) explains the term by *ὁ πρὸς γένος ἴδιος καὶ ἀμαθής.* Cic. Phil. 7, *Quæ non modo istum ingeniosum atque intelligentem, verum etiam quemvis nostrum quos ille* idiotas *appellat, delectare posset.*

12. *οἱ πάλαι ἀλληλοφόνται κ. τ. λ.* See above, at c. 14.

15. *ἡδέως, ὁμολ. τ. Χριστὸν, ἀποθνήσκομεν.* Melito ap. Euseb. H. E. IV. 26, *ἡμεῖς ἡδέως φέρομεν τοῦ τοιούτου θανάτου τὸ γέρας.* See also on c. 11, 9; and compare Tertul. Apol. c. 49; Lactant. Inst. Div. v. 13.

17. *ἡ γλῶσσ' ὀμώμοκεν, ἡ δὲ φ. ἀν.* The MSS. have *γλῶσσα*, but most editors have marked the necessary elision, though Braunius and Otto alone have given *ὀμώμοκεν* with the smooth breathing. Others incorrectly *aspirate* the verb. Doubtless the reader is aware that the line is a quotation from Eurip. Hipp. 608. It is quoted in the same way as Justin gives it by the Scholiast on Soph. Œd. c. 238. Euripides, however, unquestionably wrote *ὀμώμοχ'.* For the rest, see Monk ad l. c.

18. *γελοῖον ἢ δὴ πρᾶγμα. It were indeed a ridiculous affair.* The reading of the MSS. and most edd. is *ἤδη.* Of the various emendations, *δὲ, δ' ἦν, δ' εἴη, εἴη δὲ, ἢ δὲ,* and *ἢ δὴ,* that of Grabe, adopted by Otto as the easiest, has been received into the text.

18. *ὑμῖν. Braunius male ἡμῖν.* OTTO.

ἄφθαρτον δυναμένων ὑμῶν αὐτοῖς παρασχεῖν· ἡμᾶς δὲ, ἀφθαρσίας ἐρῶντας, μὴ πάνθ' ὑπομεῖναι ὑπὲρ τοῦ τὰ ποθούμενα παρὰ τοῦ δυναμένου δοῦναι λαβεῖν.

Other prophecies concerning the preaching of the Apostles, and the rapid progress of Christianity.

XL. *Ἀκούσατε δὲ πῶς καὶ περὶ τῶν κηρυξάντων τὴν διδαχὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ μηνυσάντων τὴν ἐπιφανείαν προεῤῥέθη, τοῦ προειρημένου προφήτου καὶ βασιλέως οὕτως εἰπόντος διὰ τοῦ προφητικοῦ πνεύματος· Ἡμέρα τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐρεύγεται ῥῆμα, καὶ νὺξ τῇ νυκτὶ ἀναγγέλλει γνῶσιν. Οὐκ εἰσι λαλιαὶ οὐδὲ λόγοι, ὧν οὐχὶ ἀκούονται αἱ φωναὶ αὐτῶν. Εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἐξῆλθεν ὁ φθόγγος αὐτῶν, καὶ εἰς τὰ πέρατα τῆς οἰκουμένης τὰ ῥήματα αὐτῶν. Ἐν τῷ ἡλίῳ ἔθετο τὸ σκήνωμα αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸς, ὡς νυμφίος ἐκπορευόμενος ἐκ παστοῦ αὐτοῦ, ἀγαλλιάσεται ὡς γίγας δραμεῖν ὁδόν. Πρὸς τούτοις δὲ καὶ λόγων ἑτέρων, τῶν προφητευθέντων δι' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Δαβὶδ, καλῶς ἔχον καὶ οἰκείως ἐπιμνησθῆναι λελογίσμεθα· ἐξ ὧν μαθεῖν ὑμῖν πάρεστι, πῶς προτρέπεται ζῆν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα, καὶ πῶς μηνύει τὴν γεγενημένην Ἡρώδου τοῦ βασιλέως Ἰουδαίων, καὶ αὐτῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ Πιλάτου τοῦ ὑμετέρου παρ' αὐτοῖς γενομένου ἐπιτρόπου σὺν τοῖς αὐτοῦ στρατιώταις κατὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ συνέλευσιν· καὶ ὅτι πιστεύεσθαι ἔμελλεν ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκ παντὸς γένους ἀνθρώπων· καὶ ὅτι αὐτὸν υἱὸν καλεῖ ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ ὑποτάσσειν αὐτῷ πάντας ἐχθροὺς ἀπήγγελται· καὶ πῶς οἱ δαίμονες, ὅσον ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, τήν τε τοῦ πατρὸς πάντων καὶ δεσπότου Θεοῦ καὶ τὴν αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐξουσίαν φυγεῖν*

XL. 4. *ἡμέρα τῇ ἡμέρᾳ κ. τ. λ.* This quotation of Ps. xix. 2 sqq. is also referred by St. Paul to the preaching of the Apostles. See Rom. x. 18.

12. *ἔχον.* Davies and Braunius would read *ἔχειν.* The change might improve the construction, but it is not essential.

15. *τὴν γεγενημένην Ἡρώδου κ. τ. λ.* Compare Acts iv. 27.

18. *ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκ πάντος γένους ἀνθρώπων.* Not only Justin, but the Fathers generally, speak of the Gospel as having, even in their days, been successfully propagated in the remotest countries of the then known world. Thus in Dial. Tryph. c. 117, *οὐδὲ ἓν ὅλως ἐστὶ τὸ γένος ἀνθρώπων, εἴτε βαρβάρων εἴτε Ἑλλήνων, ἐν οἷς μὴ διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ σταυρωθέντος Ἰησοῦ εὐχαὶ καὶ εὐχαριστίαι τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ποιητῇ τῶν ὅλων γίνονται.* The statement must of course be received with due limitation: and so in Iren. Hær. III. 11, *κατέσπαρται ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς.* Tertul. c. Marc. III. 20, *Christus totum jam orbem evangelii sui fide capit.* See also Herm. Past. III. 9, 17; Arnob. c. Gent. II. 5, 12; Iren. Hær. I. 2; Clem. Alex. Strom. VI. 18, 107; Tertul. adv. Jud. c. 7; Origen. c. Cels. I. 27, II. 13; Euseb. Præp. Ev. I. 3, IV. 15.

πειρῶνται· καὶ ὡς εἰς μετάνοιαν καλεῖ πάντας ὁ Θεὸς, πρὶν ἐλθεῖν τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς κρίσεως. Εἴρηνται δὲ οὕτως· Μακάριος ἀνὴρ, ὃς οὐκ ἐπορεύθη ἐν βουλῇ ἀσεβῶν, καὶ ἐν ὁδῷ ἁμαρτωλῶν οὐκ ἔστη, καὶ ἐπὶ καθέδραν λοιμῶν οὐκ ἐκάθισεν, ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κυρίου τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτοῦ μελετήσει ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός. Καὶ ἔσται ὡς τὸ ξύλον τὸ πεφυτευμένον παρὰ τὰς διεξόδους τῶν ὑδάτων, ὃ τὸν καρπὸν αὐτοῦ δώσει ἐν καιρῷ αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ φύλλον αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἀποῤῥυήσεται, καὶ πάντα, ὅσα ἂν ποιῇ, κατευοδωθήσεται. Οὐχ οὕτως οἱ ἀσεβεῖς, οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλ' ἢ ὡσεὶ χνοῦς, ὃν ἐκρίπτει ὁ ἄνεμος ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς. Διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἀναστήσονται ἀσεβεῖς ἐν κρίσει, οὐδὲ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἐν βουλῇ δικαίων· ὅτι γινώσκει κύριος ὁδὸν δικαίων, καὶ ὁδὸς ἀσεβῶν ἀπολεῖται.—Ἵνα τί ἐφρύαξαν ἔθνη, καὶ λαοὶ ἐμελέτησαν καινά; παρέστησαν οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς, καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες συνήχθησαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ κατὰ τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ κατὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ, λέγοντες, Διαῤῥήξωμεν τοὺς δεσμοὺς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἀποῤῥίψωμεν ἀφ' ἡμῶν τὸν ζυγὸν αὐτῶν· Ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἐκγελάσεται αὐτοὺς, καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐκμυκτηριεῖ αὐτούς. Τότε λαλήσει πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐν ὀργῇ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν τῷ θυμῷ αὐτοῦ ταράξει αὐτούς. Ἐγὼ δὲ κατεστάθην βασιλεὺς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ Σιὼν ὄρος τὸ ἅγιον αὐτοῦ, διαγγέλλων τὸ πρόσταγμα κυρίου. Κύριος εἶπε πρός με, Υἱός μου εἶ σύ· ἐγω σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε. Αἴτησαι

25. *μακάριος ἀνὴρ κ. τ. λ.* This citation, which extends to the end of the chapter, is composed of the first and second Psalms entire.

26. *λοιμῶν.* The substantive λοιμὸς, as well as the Latin *pestis*, is frequently applied to *persons* in the sense of λοιμωδής. Ælian. V. H. XIV. 11, *δόξης φρόντιζε, καὶ μὴ ἴσο λοιμός.* Acts xxiv. 5, *εὑρόντες τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον λοιμόν.* Cic. pro Rabir. c. 1, *Pestem ac perditorem civitatis.* Sall. B. J. c. 14, *Postquam illa pestis ex Africa ejecta est.* So βλαβὴ for βλαβερὸς, in Soph. Elect. 303.

37. *καινά.* Otto remarks that there are *eight* MSS. of the LXX, which exhibit this reading in Ps. ii. 1. At the same time there is no reasonable doubt that *κενὰ* is there the true reading; though this may not be sufficient authority for altering Justin's text.

39. *διαῤῥήξωμεν τοὺς δεσμοὺς αὐτῶν κ. τ. λ.* This passage is also applied to the opposition directed against the preaching of the Apostles, in Tertull. c. Marcion. III. 22, *Sic et ab ipso Judaismo divertentes* Apostoli, *cum Legis obligamenta et onera Evangelicâ jam libertate mutarent, Psalmum exsequebantur,* Disrumpamus vincula eorum, et abjiciamus a nobis jugum eorum. *Postea certè* tumultuatæ sunt gentes, et populi meditati sunt inania. *Quæ dehinc passi sunt Apostoli? Omnem, inquis, iniquitatem persecutionum.*

παρ' ἐμοῦ, καὶ δώσω σοι ἔθνη τὴν κληρονομίαν σου, καὶ τὴν κατάσχεσίν σου τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς. Ποιμανεῖς αὐτοὺς ἐν ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ· ὡς σκεύη κεραμέως συντρίψεις αὐτούς. Καὶ νῦν, βασιλεῖς, σύνετε· παιδεύθητε, πάντες οἱ κρίνοντες τὴν γῆν. Δουλεύσατε τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν φόβῳ, καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε αὐτῷ ἐν τρόμῳ. Δράξασθε παιδείας, μή ποτε ὀργισθῇ κύριος, καὶ ἀπολεῖσθε ἐξ ὁδοῦ δικαίας, ὅταν ἐκκαυθῇ ἐν τάχει ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ. Μακάριοι πάντες οἱ πεποιθότες ἐπ' αὐτόν.

A prophecy of David respecting the Kingdom of Christ existing after his crucifixion.

XLI. Καὶ πάλιν δι' ἄλλης προφητείας μηνύον τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα δι' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Δαβὶδ, ὅτι μετὰ τὸ σταυρωθῆναι βασιλεύσει ὁ Χριστὸς, οὕτως εἶπεν· Ἄισατε τῷ κυρίῳ, πᾶσα ἡ γῆ, καὶ ἀναγγείλατε ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ· ὅτι μέγας κύριος καὶ αἰνετὸς σφόδρα, φοβερὸς ὑπὲρ πάντας τοὺς θεούς. Ὅτι πάντες οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν εἴδωλα δαιμονίων εἰσὶν, ὁ δὲ Θεὸς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἐποίησε· δόξα καὶ αἶνος κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἰσχὺς καὶ καύχημα ἐν τόπῳ ἁγιάσματος αὐτοῦ. Δότε τῷ κυρίῳ τῷ πατρὶ τῶν αἰώνων δόξαν. Λάβετε χάριν, καὶ εἰσέλθετε κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ, καὶ προσκυνήσατε ἐν αὐλαῖς ἁγίαις αὐτοῦ· φοβηθήτω ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ πᾶσα ἡ γῆ, καὶ κατορθωθήτω καὶ μὴ σαλευθήτω. Εὐφρανθήτωσαν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν· ὁ κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου.

52. δράξασθε παιδείας. *Embrace instruction.* With this translation of the LXX, the Chaldee, Arabic, Æthiopic, and Vulgate versions agree. The Eng. Tr., closely following the original, is *Kiss the Son.* Now the word rendered *Son* is not the Hebrew בן *ben*, but the Chaldee בר *bar;* and it is somewhat curious that the purity of the old language should have been thus corrupted. Hence it has been thought that בר is also a true Hebrew root, signifying *purity;* so that the correct rendering would be, *Embrace that which is pure,* or, in other words, *divine instruction.*

XLI. 3. ᾄσατε τῷ κυρίῳ κ. τ. λ. Compare 1 Chron. xvi. 23, 25—31, with Ps. xcvi. 1, 2, 4—10. Thirlby supposes that the omissions in the citation are chargeable upon Justin's transcribers, as well as the substitution of the words τῷ πατρὶ τῶν αἰώνων for αἱ πατριαὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν, which is the reading of the LXX. The latter part of the supposition is at least probable from the fact, that these words are correctly quoted in Dial. Tryph. c. 73. At the same time, Justin is not always consistent in his manner of citing the Scriptures.

14. ἐβασίλευσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου. In Dial. Tryph. (cc. 71 sqq.) Justin specifies four passages of the LXX version of the Old Testament, which he charged the Jews with corrupting; and among them is the present text, from which he asserts that the words ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου have been struck out by them, as being

XLII. Ὅταν δὲ τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα τὰ μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι ὡς ἤδη γενόμενα λέγῃ, ὡς καὶ ἐν τοῖς προειρημένοις δοξάσαι ἐστὶν, ὅπως ἀπολογίαν μὴ παράσχῃ τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσιν, καὶ τοῦτο διασαφήσομεν. Τὰ πάντως ἐγνωσμένα γενησόμενα προλέγει, ὡς ἤδη γενόμενα. Ὅτι δὲ οὕτως δεῖ ἐκδέχεσθαι, ἐνατενίσατε τῷ νοῒ τοῖς λεγομένοις. Δαβὶδ

Things future are frequently described in prophetic language as if they were past.

prophetic of the crucifixion. Certain it is, that in none of the existing copies of the LXX are they to be found; nor is there any thing answering to them in the Hebrew. Many of the Latin Fathers, however, refer to the text, as if the words were genuine. Thus Tertull. adv. Jud. c. 11, *Age nunc, si legisti penes prophetam in Psalmis,* Deus regnavit a ligno, *expecto quid intelligas, ne forte* lignarium *aliquem* regem *significari putetis, et non Christum, qui exinde a passione Christi* (Crucis?) *superatâ morte regnavit.* And again, in c. 13, *Unde et ipse David* regnaturum ex ligno *Dominum dicebat.* To the same effect it is cited by Arnobius, Lactantius, Augustine, and others: but by no Greek Fathers, except Justin; unless indeed, as some have imagined, it may be recognized in Barnab. Epist. c. 8, ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τῷ ξύλῳ. By some writers Justin himself is supposed to have interpolated the words; and, if so, for an obvious purpose. See Bishop Kaye's Justin, p. 44, *note.*

XLII. 1. ὅταν..λέγῃ. *Scribi posset etiam,* ὅτι λέγει. SYLBURG. The emendation would certainly impede, rather than improve, the sense.

3. ὅπως ἀπολογίαν μὴ παράσχῃ τ. ἐ. *That the circumstance may afford no excuse to readers* for misinterpreting them. So Rom. i. 20, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους. That this is the meaning of the passage may be inferred from Justin's observation in c. 55, καί, ὅση δύναμις, προτρεψάμενοι ὑμᾶς ἀνεύθυνοι οἴδαμεν λοιπὸν ὄντες, κἂν ὑμεῖς ἀπιστεῖτε· τὸ γὰρ ἡμέτερον γέγονε καὶ πεπέρανται. And again in c. 61, ἐξηγήσομεθα, ὅπως μὴ τοῦτο παραλιπόντες δόξωμεν πονηρεύειν τι ἐν τῇ ἐξηγήσει. Compare also Dial. Tryph. cc. 38, 44, 58, 82. The conjectures, ἀντιλογίαν, ἀπορίαν, and ἀλογίαν, have equally originated in a misapprehension of the sentiment expressed. Of the verb ἐντυγχάνειν, see on c. 14, 3.

4. τὰ πάντως ἐγνωσμένα κ. τ. λ. Tertull. c. Marcion. III. *Divinitati competit, quæcumque decreverit, ut perfecta reputare; quia non sit apud illam differentia temporis, ad quam uniformem statum temporis dirigit æternitas ipsa. Et divinationi propheticæ magis familiare est, id quod prospiciat, dum prospicit, jam visum, atque ita jam expunctum, id est omnimodo futurum, demonstrare.* Before προλέγει, repeat τὸ πρ. πνεῦμα from the foregoing sentence.

6. ἐνατενίσατε τῷ νοΐ. Properly, ἀτενίζειν signifies *to look earnestly* at any thing; or, as explained by the grammarians, ἀτενὲς βλέπειν. We have in Lucian. Fugit. p. 791, ἀτενέσι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καθορᾶν. The verb is used frequently by St. Luke, followed either by a *dative* or an accusative with εἰς. See Luke iv. 20; Acts i. 10; iii. 14. Here, however, it is clearly applied to *mental vision;* as βλέπειν in Mark iii. 9; 1 Cor. i. 26; Phil. iii. 2.—As here declined, after the third declension, the substantive νοῦς is invariably found in the New Testament, and more commonly in Philo and the Patristical writers. Thus the *genitive* νοὸς occurs in Rom. xii. 2; 1 Cor. xiv. 19; Eph. iv. 17, and elsewhere; and the *dative* νοΐ in

ἔτεσι χιλίοις καὶ πεντακοσίοις πρὶν ἢ Χριστὸν ἄνθρωπον γενόμενον σταυρωθῆναι, τὰ προειρημένα ἔφη, καὶ οὐδεὶς τῶν πρὸ ἐκείνου γενομένων σταυρωθεὶς εὐφροσύνην παρέσχε τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τῶν μετ' ἐκεῖνον. Ὁ καθ' ἡμᾶς δὲ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς σταυρωθεὶς καὶ ἀποθανὼν ἀνέστη, καὶ ἐβασίλευσεν ἀνελθὼν εἰς οὐρανόν· καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς παρ' αὐτοῦ διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐν τοῖς πᾶσιν ἔθνεσι κηρυχθεῖσιν εὐφροσύνη ἐστὶ προσδοκώντων τὴν κατηγγελμένην ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἀφθαρσίαν.

But although events, in order to be foretold, must also be foreknown, this does not imply a fatal necessity, by which the actions of men are irresistibly controlled; for man could be the object neither of reward nor punishment, if he were virtuous or wicked, not by choice, but by birth.

XLIII. Ὅπως δὲ μή τινες ἐκ τῶν προλελεγμένων ὑφ' ἡμῶν δοξάσωσι καθ' εἱμαρμένης ἀνάγκην φάσκειν ἡμᾶς τὰ γινόμενα γίνεσθαι, ἐκ τοῦ προειπεῖν προεγνωσμένα, καὶ τοῦτο διαλύομεν. Τὰς τιμωρίας καὶ τὰς κολάσεις, καὶ τὰς ἀγαθὰς ἀμοιβάς, κατ' ἀξίαν τῶν πράξεων ἑκάστου ἀποδίδοσθαι διὰ τῶν προφητῶν μαθόντες, καὶ ἀληθὲς ἀποφαινόμεθα. Ἐπεὶ εἰ μὴ τοῦτό ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ καθ' εἱμαρμένην πάντα γίνεται, οὔτε τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἐστὶν ὅλως. Εἰ γὰρ εἵμαρται τόνδε τινὰ ἀγαθὸν εἶναι, καὶ τόνδε φαῦλον, οὔθ' οὗτος ἀποδεκτὸς, οὐδὲ ἐκεῖνος μεμπτέος. Καὶ αὖ, εἰ μὴ προαιρέσει ἐλευθέρᾳ πρὸς τὸ φεύγειν τὰ αἰσχρὰ, καὶ

Rom. vii. 25; 1 Cor. i. 10; xiv. 15. The same may be said of πλοῦς, of which the *genitive* πλοὸς occurs in Acts xxvii. 9. See Buttmann's Gr. Gr. §. 56; Fischer ad Well. II. p. 181; and my *Gr. Gram. of the N. T. Dialect*, § 9, obs. 1.

7. ἔτεσι χιλίοις καὶ π. See above on c. 31, 36; and on c. 46, *infra*.

XLIII. 1. ὑφ' ἡμῶν. Ed. Steph. ὑμῶν. Probably an error of the press.

4. διαλύομεν. Sylburg proposes either διαλύσομεν in the future tense, or διαλύωμεν in the conjunctive mood. The former is much in Justin's manner, as διασαφήσομεν in the last chapter; but the latter is altogether unlikely.

5. ἑκάστου. Thirlby would read ἑκάστῳ, but nothing would be gained by the change.

8. τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῖν. *Our free-agency.*

— εἰ γὰρ εἵρμαρται κ. τ. λ. Not Justin only, but most of the early writers, were earnest combatants of that fearful doctrine of fatalism, which had its origin in the cold philosophy of the Stoic school; and as ardent advocates of that moral freedom of the will, upon which the true Scriptural doctrine of a future retribution rests. See Tatian. Orat. c. Græc. c. 8; Min. F. Octav. c. 36; Clem. Alex. Strom. IV. 7, 54; VII. 4, 20; Hierocl. de Prov. et Fato ap. Phot. Bibl. c. 214; Euseb. Præp. Ev. IV. 6; Origen. c. Cels. II.; Chrysost. in Matt. Hom. 60; Augustin. de Ver. Rel. c. 14; Epist. 46. See, on this subject, Bishop Kaye's Justin, c. 3.—For γάρ, Thirlby would unnecessarily substitute δέ.

10. ἀποδεκτός. *Alterutrum legendum credit* H. Steph. *aut* ἀποδεκτέος *aut* μεμπτός. *Illud verum est, hoc falsum.* BRAUN.

αἱρεῖσθαι τὰ καλὰ, δύναμιν ἔχει τὸ ἀνθρώπειον γένος, ἀναίτιόν ἐστι τῶν ὁπωσδήποτε πραττομένων. Ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐλευθέρᾳ προαιρέσει καὶ κατορθοῖ, καὶ σφάλλεται, οὕτως ἀποδείκνυμεν. Τὸν αὐτὸν ἄνθρωπον τῶν ἐναντίων τὴν μετέλευσιν ποιούμενον ὁρῶμεν. Εἰ δὲ εἵμαρτο ἢ φαῦλον ἢ σπουδαῖον εἶναι, οὐκ ἄν ποτε τῶν ἐναντίων δεικτικὸς ἦν, καὶ πλειστάκις μετετίθετο· ἀλλ' οὐδ' οἱ μὲν ἦσαν σπουδαῖοι, οἱ δὲ φαῦλοι, ἐπεὶ τὴν εἱμαρμένην αἰτίαν φαύλων, καὶ ἐναντία ἑαυτῇ πράττουσαν ἀποφαινόμεθα, ἢ ἐκεῖνο τὸ προειρημένον δόξαι ἀληθὲς εἶναι, ὅτι οὐδέν ἐστιν ἀρετὴ οὐδὲ κακία, ἀλλὰ δόξῃ μόνον ἢ ἀγαθὰ ἢ κακὰ νομίζεται, ἥπερ, ὡς δείκνυσιν ὁ ἀληθὴς λόγος, μεγίστη ἀσέβεια καὶ ἀδικία ἐστίν. Ἀλλ' εἱμαρμένην φαμὲν ἀπαράβατον ταύτην εἶναι, τοῖς τὰ καλὰ ἐκλεγομένοις, τὰ ἄξια ἐπιτίμια, καὶ τοῖς ὁμοίως τὰ ἐναντία, τὰ ἄξια ἐπίχειρα. Οὐ γὰρ ὥσπερ τὰ ἄλλα, οἷον δένδρα καὶ τετράποδα, μηδὲν δυνάμενα προαιρέσει πράττειν, ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦν ἄξιος ἀμοιβῆς ἢ ἐπαίνου, οὐκ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ἑλόμενος τὸ ἀγαθὸν, ἀλλὰ τοῦτο γενόμενος· οὐδ', εἰ κακὸς ὑπῆρχε, δικαίως κολάσεως ἐτύγχανεν, οὐκ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ τοιοῦτος ὤν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲν δυνάμενος εἶναι ἕτερον παρ' ὃ ἐγεγόνει.

Indeed the freedom of the will is proved by the exhortations of Scripture, from which also Plato derived his notion of human responsibility; and of which the evil spirits had endeavoured to prevent the perusal, with a view to impede the knowledge of the truth.

XLIV. *Ἐδίδαξε δὲ ἡμᾶς ταῦτα τὸ ἅγιον προφητικὸν πνεῦμα, διὰ Μωσέως φῆσαν τῷ πρώτῳ πλασθέντι ἀνθρώπῳ εἰρῆσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὕτως· Ἰδοὺ πρὸ προσώπου σου τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ τὸ κακὸν, ἐκλέξαι τὸ ἀγαθόν. Καὶ πάλιν διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ ἑτέρου προφήτου, ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων*

20. *ἀποφαινόμεθα.* Sylburg would read *ἀποφαινοίμεθα* in the optative, to correspond with *δόξαι* in the following clause; and Grabe, Thirlby, Thalemann, and Otto, seem to approve of the emendation.

— *ἐκεῖνο τὸ προειρημένον.* The reference is to c. 28.

25. *καὶ τοῖς ὁμοίως τὰ ἐναντία.* *Non minus apte, transposito articulo, legeris, καὶ ὁμοίως τοῖς τὰ ἐνάντια.* SYLBURG.

26. *οὐ γὰρ ὥσπερ τὰ ἄλλα, κ. τ. λ.* Compare Apol. II. c. 7; Dial. Tryph. cc. 88, 102, 141.

28. *οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦν ἄξιος ἀμοιβῆς κ. τ. λ.* Iren. Hær. IV. 72, 1, *εἰ φύσει οἱ μὲν φαῦλοι, οἱ δὲ ἀγαθοὶ γεγόνασιν, οὐδ' οὗτοι ἐπαινετοὶ, ὄντες ἀγαθοὶ, τοιοῦτοι γὰρ κατεσκευάσθησαν· οὔτ' ἐκεῖνοι μεμπτοὶ, οὕτως γεγονότες.* Compare also Hær. IV. 37, §§. 2, 6.

XLIV. 3. *ἰδοὺ πρὸ προσώπου κ. τ. λ.* These words are slightly altered from Deut. xxx. 15, 19. It should seem that Justin has mixed up with them a passage in the Apocryphal book of Ecclesiasticus (xv. 14 sqq.).

καὶ δεσπότου Θεοῦ, εἰς τοῦτο λεχθῆναι οὕτως· Λούσασθε, καθαροὶ γένεσθε, ἀφέλετε τὰς πονηρίας ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν, μάθετε καλὸν ποιεῖν, κρίνατε ὀρφανῷ καὶ δικαιώσατε χήραν, καὶ δεῦτε καὶ διαλεχθῶμεν, λέγει κύριος· καὶ ἐὰν ὦσιν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ὑμῶν ὡς φοινικοῦν, ὡσεὶ ἔριον λευκανῶ, καὶ ἐὰν ὦσιν ὡς κόκκινον, ὡς χίονα λευκανῶ. Καὶ ἐὰν θέλητε, καὶ εἰσακούσητέ μου, τὰ ἀγαθὰ τῆς γῆς φάγεσθε· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ εἰσακούσητέ μου, μάχαιρα ὑμᾶς κατέδεται· τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου ἐλάλησε ταῦτα. Τὸ δὲ προειρημένον, Μάχαιρα ὑμᾶς κατέδεται, οὐ λέγει διὰ μαχαιρῶν φονευθήσεσθαι τοὺς παρακούσαντας, ἀλλ' ἡ μάχαιρα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστι τὸ πῦρ, οὗ βορὰ γίνονται οἱ τὰ φαῦλα πράττειν αἱρούμενοι. Διὰ τοῦτο λέγει, Μάχαιρα ὑμᾶς κατέδεται· τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου ἐλάλησεν. Εἰ δὲ καὶ περὶ τεμνούσης καὶ αὐτίκα ἀπαλλασσούσης μαχαίρας ἔλεγεν, οὐκ ἂν εἶπε, Κατέδεται. Ὥστε καὶ Πλάτων εἰπών, Αἰτία ἑλομένου, θεὸς

6. *λούσασθε, καθαροὶ γένεσθε, κ. τ. λ.* From Isai. i. 16 sqq. These two citations from Moses and Isaiah are adduced in connexion, and for the same purpose, by Clement of Alexandria (Protrep. VII. 70), who has moreover borrowed the somewhat fanciful exposition, into which Justin has digressed, of the words *μάχαιρα ὑμᾶς κατέδεται.* The expression is clearly conformable with oriental phraseology; and thus the *mouth of the sword* is a common phrase, occurring in the original Hebrew of Job, i. 15, 17; Jerem. xxi. 7. Justin again quotes the passage from Isaiah in c. 61, where he explains it to be prophetic of Christian baptism.

11. *καὶ ἐὰν θέλητε, κ. τ. λ.* Clem. Alex. Strom. I., *Voluntaria est electio, et delectus veritatis spontaneus; et ex omnibus hominibus vocatis, qui obedire vocanti in animum induxerunt, vocati dicuntur. Non est enim apud Deum iniquitas sive injustitia, neque nobis Deus pravitatis est auctor....Ad eos* (credentes, scilicet et obedientes) *prophetia loquitur,* si volueritis et audieritis me, bona terræ comedetis: *in nostra potestate sitam esse arguens et deligendi et rejiciendi vim.*

17. *γίνονται.* Thirlby would read *γενήσονται.* There is no reason to suspect the correctness of the received text.

21. *αἰτία ἑλομένου, θεὸς δ' ἀναίτιος.* The citation is from Plat. de Repub. x. vol. VII. p. 330. (ed. Bipont). It is quoted also in Clem. Alex. Strom. v. 14, 137, and Theodor. adv. Græc. II. Both in Plato and Clement the particle *δ'* is omitted. It is worthy of observation that Justin does not, as some have imagined, build his doctrine of human responsibility upon Plato; but asserts that Plato originally derived his notions on the subject from the Scriptures. Indeed he repeatedly maintains that the Grecian philosophy obtained its most excellent dogmas either directly from the writings of the Old Testament, or from a partial illumination imparted by the Logos. When left to itself, it abounded in self-contradictions, even in the very elements of knowledge. See above on c. 5, 18, c. 20, 6. Hence it is that he appeals to the high antiquity of Moses; of which, as well as of

δ' ἀναίτιος, παρὰ Μωσέως τοῦ προφήτου λαβὼν εἶπε. Πρεσβύτερος γὰρ Μωσῆς καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν Ἕλλησι συγγραφέων. Καὶ πάντα ὅσα περὶ ἀθανασίας ψυχῆς, ἢ τιμωριῶν τῶν μετὰ θάνατον, ἢ θεωρίας οὐρανίων, ἢ τῶν ὁμοίων δογμάτων, καὶ φιλόσοφοι καὶ ποιηταὶ ἔφασαν, παρὰ τῶν προφητῶν τὰς ἀφορμὰς λαβόντες καὶ νοῆσαι δεδύνηνται καὶ ἐξηγήσαντο. Ὅθεν παρὰ πᾶσι σπέρματα ἀληθείας δοκεῖ εἶναι· ἐλέγχονται δὲ μὴ ἀκριβῶς νοήσαντες, ὅταν ἐναντία αὐτοὶ ἑαυτοῖς λέγωσιν. Ὥστε ὅ φαμεν πεπροφητεῦσθαι τὰ μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι, οὐ διὰ τὸ εἱμαρμένης ἀνάγκῃ πράττεσθαι λέγομεν· ἀλλὰ προγνώστου τοῦ Θεοῦ ὄντος τῶν μελλόντων ὑπὸ πάντων ἀνθρώπων πραχθήσεσθαι, καὶ δόγματος ὄντος παρ' αὐτὸν κατ' ἀξίαν τῶν πράξεων ἕκαστον ἀμείψεσθαι μέλλοντα τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τὰ παρ' αὐτοῦ κατ' ἀξίαν τῶν πραττομένων ἀπαντήσεσθαι, διὰ τοῦ προφητικοῦ πνεύματος προλέγει, εἰς ἐπίτασιν καὶ ἀνάμνησιν ἀεὶ ἄγων τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος, δεικνὺς ὅτι καὶ μέλον ἐστὶν αὐτῷ, καὶ προνοεῖται αὐτῶν. Κατ' ἐνέργειαν δὲ τῶν φαύλων δαιμόνων θάνατος ὡρίσθη κατὰ τῶν τὰς Ὑστάσπου ἢ Σιβύλλης ἢ τῶν προφητῶν βίβλους ἀναγινωσκόντων, ὅπως διὰ τοῦ φόβου ἀποστρέψωσιν ἐντυγχάνοντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τῶν καλῶν γνῶσιν λαβεῖν, αὐτοῖς δὲ δουλεύοντας κατέχωσιν· ὅπερ εἰς τέλος οὐκ ἴσχυσαν πρᾶξαι.

that of Prophecy in general, he has elsewhere adduced the proof. See Cohort. ad Græc. c. 9. Compare also Apol. I. cc. 23, 59; Dial. Tryph. c. 7.

30. *ὥστε ὅ φαμεν κ. τ. λ.* Davies would read *ὡς ὅτι φαμεν π. τὰ μ. γίνεσθαι, οὐ διὰ τοῦτο εἱμαρμένης κ. τ. λ.* If any change is necessary, which may be fairly doubted, perhaps *ὥστε ἃ φαμεν πεπροφητεῦσθαι μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι* may be deemed an improvement upon the common text.

34. *δόγματος ὄντος παρ' αὐτὸν κ. τ. λ.* *Vulgo* *παρ' αὐτῶν*, which is unintelligible. Thalemann suggests *παρ' αὐτοῖς*, which is no better. Without mentioning other emendations, suffice it to say that the Benedictine editor proposed to read *παρ' αὐτῷ*, in which case *μέλλοντα* must be changed into *μέλλοντι*, or more simply *παρ' αὐτόν*. The sense plainly requires that the pronoun should have reference to the Deity; and accordingly the latter of the two conjectures, as being the readiest, and therefore the best, has been received into the text. Justin is repeating the argument of the last chapter, that rewards and punishments will not hereafter depend upon an irreversible decree of fate, but be apportioned to the degree of virtue and vice which men have severally practised.

40. *θάνατος ὡρίσθη.* This assertion has been called in question; nor are the arguments of Casaubon and others in support of Justin's historical credibility by any means conclusive. Of *Hystaspes* and the *Sibyl* see above, on c. 20, 1.

Ἀφόβως μὲν γὰρ οὐ μόνον ἐντυγχάνομεν αὐταῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑμῖν, ὡς ὁρᾶτε, εἰς ἐπίσκεψιν φέρομεν, ἐπιστάμενοι πᾶσιν εὐάρεστα φανήσεσθαι. Κἂν ὀλίγους δὲ πείσωμεν, τὰ μέγιστα κερδήσαντες ἐσόμεθα· ὡς γεωργοὶ γὰρ ἀγαθοὶ παρὰ τοῦ δεσπόζοντος τὴν ἀμοιβὴν ἕξομεν.

Returning from his digression, Justin proceeds to shew that Christ's Ascension into heaven was predicted by David, after which the Gospel would be preached to the world, beginning at Jerusalem.

XLV. Ὅτι δὲ ἀγαγεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ὁ πατὴρ τῶν πάντων Θεὸς μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆσαι ἐκ νεκρῶν αὐτὸν ἔμελλε, καὶ κατέχειν ἕως ἂν πατάξῃ τοὺς ἐχθραίνοντας αὐτῷ δαίμονας, καὶ συντελεσθῇ ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν προεγνωσμένων αὐτῷ ἀγαθῶν γινομένων καὶ ἐναρέτων, δι' οὓς καὶ μηδέπω τὴν ἐπικύρωσιν πεποίηται, ἐπακούσατε τῶν εἰρημένων διὰ Δαβὶδ τοῦ προφήτου. Ἔστι δὲ ταῦτα· Εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου, κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου. Ῥάβδον δυνάμεως ἐξαποστελεῖ σοι κύριος ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ· καὶ κατακυρίευε ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἐχθρῶν σου. Μετὰ σοῦ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῆς δυνάμεώς σου ἐν ταῖς λαμπρότησι τῶν ἁγίων σου· ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἑωσφόρου ἐγέννησά σε. Τὸ οὖν εἰρημένον, Ῥάβδον δυνάμεως ἐξαποστελεῖ σοι ἐξ Ἱερουσαλὴμ, προαγγελτικὸν τοῦ λόγου τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ, ὃν ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ οἱ ἀπόστολοι αὐτοῦ ἐξελθόντες πανταχοῦ ἐκήρυξαν, καὶ, καίπερ

XLV. 1. *ἀγαγεῖν τὸν X.* This is the reading of the MSS. Thirlby, however, is probably right in his conjecture, that *ἀνάγειν* is the true reading; with whom Braunius and Otto agree, though it would be scarcely justifiable to alter the text. Thus Dial. Tryph. c. 32, *ἐρῶ ὑμῖν καὶ ἄλλους λόγους εἰρημένους διὰ Δαβὶδ τοῦ μακαρίου, ἐξ ὧν καὶ κύριον τὸν Χριστὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου προφητικοῦ πνεύματος λεγόμενον νοήσετε, καὶ τὸν κύριον πάντων πατέρα ἀνάγοντα αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς καὶ καθίζοντα αὐτὸν ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ, ἕως ἂν θῇ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ.*

3. *καὶ κατέχειν. Non est* Thirlbii *conjectura opus, κἀκεῖ κατέχειν.* OTTO.

5. *δι' οὓς καὶ μηδέπω κ. τ. λ.* See on c. 28, 6. For *ἐπικύρωσιν*, it has been proposed to read *ἐκπύρωσιν*, and perhaps a more easy and elegant conjecture was never ventured. Compare Apol. I. cc. 20, 57, 60; II. c. 7. It has been coldly objected, however, that *ἐπικύρωσις*, signifying *a confirmed decree*, will aptly indicate the *purposed* return of Christ to judgment. So it may; and therefore the text has been left unaltered: but the word is *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον*, and the other is worth two of it.

7. *εἶπεν ὁ κύριος κ. τ. λ.* From Ps. CX. 1—3. LXX.

15. *ὃν ἀπὸ Ἱερ. οἱ ἀπόστολοι κ. τ. λ.* See above on c. 39, 8.

16. *καί, καίπερ κ. τ. λ.* The copula *καί*, evidently necessary to the sense, is omitted in the MSS. It has been restored by Braunius and Otto, who account for its omission by the similarity of the first syllable in *καίπερ* following.

θανάτου ὁρισθέντος κατὰ τῶν διδασκόντων ἢ ὅλως ὁμολογούντων τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἡμεῖς πανταχοῦ καὶ ἀσπαζόμεθα καὶ διδάσκομεν. Εἰ δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς ὡς ἐχθροὶ ἐντεύξεσθε τοῖσδε τοῖς λόγοις, οὐ πλέον τι δύνασθε, ὡς προέφημεν, τοῦ φονεύειν· ὅπερ ἡμῖν μὲν οὐδεμίαν βλάβην φέρει, ὑμῖν δὲ καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἀδίκως ἐχθραίνουσι, καὶ μὴ μετατιθεμένοις, κόλασιν διὰ πυρὸς αἰωνίαν ἐργάζεται.

XLVI. Ἵνα δὲ μή τινες ἀλογισταίνοντες εἰς ἀποτροπὴν τῶν δεδιδαγμένων ὑφ' ἡμῶν εἴπωσι, πρὸ ἐτῶν ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα γεγεννῆσθαι τὸν Χριστὸν λέγειν ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ Κυρηνίου, δεδιδαχέναι δὲ ἅ φαμεν διδάξαι αὐτόν ὕστερον χρόνοις ἐπὶ

It is not to be supposed, however, that those who lived before the preaching of the Gospel were irresponsible for their actions; since the illuminating influence of the Logos was always in operation, and ready to enlighten those who chose to avail themselves of it.

20. *ὡς προέφημεν.* The reference is to cc. 2 and 12.

22. *τοῖς ἀδικῶς ἐχθραίνουσι.* It is not necessary to insert ἡμῖν after ἀδίκως, as H. Stephens and others have supposed.

XLVI. 1. *εἰς ἀποτροπὴν τῶν δ.* *To the perversion of what we teach.* Thirlby would read ἀνατροπὴν, *refutation*, which is far less appropriate.

2. *πρὸ ἐτῶν ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα.* Without insisting upon the uncertainty respecting the year in which the early Christians placed the birth of Christ, it will here suffice to observe, that Justin is now speaking in round numbers; and adopts a century and a half as a period in which, compared with the ages that preceded the commencement of the Christian æra, a few years more or less made very little difference. A similar carelessness of chronological accuracy, with reference to the same great epoch, is found in Tertullian and other Fathers. Thus he says, *ad Nat.* I. 7, *Ætati nostræ nondum anni* 250; whereas, only two chapters onward (c. 9), he observes, *ut supra edidimus, ætatis nostræ nondum anni* 300. So Arnobius (*adv. Gentes*, I. 13): *Trecenti sunt anni ferme, minus vel plus aliquid, ex quo cœpimus esse Christiani.* In reference to this statement his opponents reply (II. 71): *Ante quadringentos annos religio, inquitis, vestra non fuit.*—With respect to the cavil which Justin is now opposing, it was a common objection with the adversaries of Christianity, that those who lived before the comparatively recent events of the birth of Christ and the publication of his doctrines, could not be responsible for their violation of his religion; and, consequently, that there could be no subsequent necessity of embracing it. See Origen. c. Cels. IV. 7; Cyrill. adv. Julian. I. 3; Jerom. Epist. ad Ctesiph. t. II. p. 172; Euseb. H. E. I. 2; V. 1; Prudent. Peristeph. H. XIV. 184. Justin replies that the work of redemption had been always going on, and that the revelations of the Logos had imparted a sanctifying influence, in a greater or less degree, to all who did not wilfully reject it. In other words, there were Christians in heart, if not in name, before the revelation of the Gospel. Compare Clem. Alex. Strom. VI. 7, 58; Euseb. H. E. I. 4. See also on c. 5, 18.

4. *ὕστερον χρόνοις.* Thirlby supposes that either χρόνοις is a gloss, or that the true reading is ἐπὶ χρ. Π. Π. Bp. Pearson imagines that a numeral has been omitted, indicating the number of years between the birth and preaching of Jesus. *An legendum ὑστέροις χρόνοις?*

Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ ἐπικαλῶσιν ὡς ἀνευθύνων ὄντων τῶν προγεγενημένων πάντων ἀνθρώπων, φθάσαντες τὴν ἀπορίαν λυσώμεθα. Τὸν Χριστὸν πρωτότοκον τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι ἐδιδάχθημεν, καὶ προεμηνύσαμεν λόγον ὄντα, οὗ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων μετέσχε· καὶ οἱ μετὰ λόγου βιώσαντες Χριστιανοί εἰσι, κἂν ἄθεοι ἐνομίσθησαν, οἷον ἐν Ἕλλησι μὲν Σωκράτης καὶ Ἡράκλειτος καὶ οἱ ὅμοιοι αὐτοῖς, ἐν βαρβάροις δὲ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἀνανίας, καὶ Ἀζαρίας καὶ Μισαὴλ καὶ Ἠλίας καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοί, ὧν τὰς πράξεις ἢ τὰ ὀνόματα καταλέγειν μακρὸν εἶναι ἐπιστάμενοι, τανῦν παραιτούμεθα. Ὥστε καὶ οἱ προγενόμενοι ἄνευ λόγου βιώσαντες, ἄχρηστοι καὶ ἐχθροὶ τῷ Χριστῷ ἦσαν, καὶ φονεῖς τῶν μετὰ λόγου βιούντων· οἱ δὲ μετὰ λόγου βιώσαντες καὶ βιοῦντες, Χριστιανοὶ καὶ ἄφοβοι καὶ ἀτάραχοι ὑπάρχουσιν. Δι' ἣν δ' αἰτίαν διὰ δυνάμεως τοῦ λόγου, κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς πάντων καὶ δεσπότου Θεοῦ βουλὴν, διὰ παρθένου ἄνθρωπος ἀπεκυήθη, καὶ Ἰησοῦς ἐπωνομάσθη, καὶ σταυρωθεὶς ἀποθανὼν ἀνέστη, καὶ ἀνελήλυθεν εἰς οὐρανὸν, ἐκ τῶν διὰ τοσούτων εἰρημένων ὁ νουνεχὴς καταλαβεῖν δυνήσεται. Ἡμεῖς δὲ, οὐκ ἀναγκαίου ὄντος τανῦν τοῦ περὶ τῆς ἀποδείξεως τούτου λόγου, ἐπὶ τὰς ἐπειγούσας ἀποδείξεις πρὸς τὸ παρὸν χωρήσωμεν.

The evidence from prophecy continued; and the fulfilment of those concerning the *destruction of Jerusalem* pointed out.

XLVII. Ὅτι οὖν καὶ ἐκπορθηθήσεσθαι ἡ γῆ Ἰουδαίων ἔμελλεν, ἀκούσατε τῶν εἰρημένων ὑπὸ τοῦ προφητικοῦ πνεύματος. Εἴρηνται δὲ οἱ λόγοι ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου λαῶν θαυμαζόντων τὰ γεγενημένα. Εἰσὶ δὲ οἵδε· Ἐγενήθη ἔρημος Σιὼν, ὡς ἔρημος ἐγενήθη Ἱερουσαλήμ· εἰς καταρὰν ὁ οἶκος

5. καὶ ἐπικαλῶσιν. *And cry out against us as though, &c.* R. Steph. would introduce ἐπικλῶσιν, from a marginal gloss of the Cod. Clar. It has also been proposed to read ἐγκαλῶσιν. The received text is perfectly satisfactory.

6. φθάσαντες τὴν ἀπορίαν λυσώμεθα. *Let us anticipate and solve the difficulty.* It may be thought that λυσόμεθα would be a better reading; but the same syntax occurs in χωρήσωμεν, at the end of the chapter; where, however, Thalemann has received χωρήσομεν into the text. See also above on c. 43, 4.

8. προεμηνύσαμεν. The reference is to cc. 5 and 28.

11. ἐν βαρβάροις. See above on c. 5, 17.

17. Χριστιανοί. *Videtur legendum* Χρηστιανοί, *propter contrarium verbum* ἄχρηστοι. GRABE. See, however, on c. 4, 3.

19. διὰ δυνάμεως τοῦ λόγου. See above on c. 33, 26.

22. διὰ τοσούτων. *So much at length.* Supply λόγων or ῥημάτων.

XLVII. 4. ἐγενήθη ἔρημος κ. τ. λ. From Isai. lxiv. 10 sqq.

τὸ ἅγιον ἡμῶν, καὶ ἡ δόξα, ἣν εὐλόγησαν οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν, ἐγενήθη πυρίκαυστος, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔνδοξα αὐτῆς συνέπεσε· καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις ἀνέσχου, καὶ ἐσιώπησας καὶ ἐταπείνωσας ἡμᾶς σφόδρα. Καὶ ὅτι ἠρήμωτο Ἱερουσαλὴμ, ὡς προείρητο γεγενῆσθαι, πεπεισμένοι ἐστέ. Εἴρηται δὲ καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐρημώσεως αὐτῆς, καὶ περὶ τοῦ μὴ ἐπιτραπήσεσθαι μηδένα αὐτῶν οἰκεῖν, διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου οὕτως· Ἡ γῆ αὐτῶν ἔρημος· ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτῶν αὐτὴν φάγονται, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ἐξ αὐτῶν ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν αὐτῇ. Ὅτι δὲ φυλάσσεται ὑφ' ὑμῶν ὅπως μηδεὶς ἐν αὐτῇ γένηται, καὶ θάνατος κατὰ τοῦ καταλαμβανομένου Ἰουδαίου εἰσιόντος ὥρισται, ἀκριβῶς ἐπίστασθε.

Prophecies respecting the *miracles* of Christ, and the *persecutions* to be endured by himself and his disciples.

XLVIII. Ὅτι δὲ καὶ θεραπεύσειν πάσας νόσους, καὶ νεκροὺς ἀνεγερεῖν, ὁ ἡμέτερος Χριστὸς προεφητεύθη, ἀκούσατε τῶν λελεγμένων. Ἔστι δὲ ταῦτα· Τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἀλεῖται χωλὸς ὡς ἔλαφος, καὶ τρανὴ ἔσται γλῶσσα μογιλάλων· τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέψουσι, καὶ λεπροὶ καθαρισθήσονται, καὶ νεκροὶ ἀναστήσονται καὶ περιπατήσουσιν. Ὅτι τε ταῦτα ἐποίησεν, ἐκ τῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου γενομένων ἀκτῶν μαθεῖν δύνασθε. Πῶς τε προμεμήνυται ὑπὸ τοῦ

9. ὅτι ἠρήμωτο κ. τ. λ. Sylburg and Thalemann would read ἠρήμωται, and also γενέσθαι or γενήσεσθαι. Otto, however, remarks that Justin probably wrote γεγενῆσθαι, because the prophecy itself is delivered in the past sense; and that, consequently, no change is desirable.

12. ἡ γῆ αὐτῶν κ. τ. λ. The former part of this citation is from Isai. i. 7. The last clause, however, is not only added from Jerem. l. 3, but is taken from a prediction respecting Babylon.

14. ὅτι δὲ φυλάσσεται κ. τ. λ. Eusebius, in his Chronicle, speaks of an imperial edict, issued in the 18th year of the reign of Adrian, which forbade any Jew to approach within sight of Jerusalem; and he has preserved the following record of Aristo Pellæus in his Hist. Eccl. iv. 6: τὸ πᾶν ἔθνος ἐξ ἐκείνου καὶ τῆς περὶ τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα γῆς πάμπαν ἐπιβαίνειν εἴργεται, νόμου δόγματι καὶ διατάξεσιν Ἀδριανοῦ, ὡς ἂν μηδ' ἐξ ἀπόπτου θεωροῖεν τὸ πατρῷον ἔδαφος, ἐγκελευσαμένου. To this edict Tertullian also seems to allude in Apol. c. 21, *Dispersi* Judæi, *palabundi et cœli et soli sui extorres, vagantur per orbem sine nomine, sine Deo rege: quibus non advenarum jure terram patriam saltem vestigio salutare conceditur.* See also Just. M. Dial. Tryph. c. 16; Tertull. adv. Jud. c. 13; Jerom. in Esai. vi.; Greg. Naz. Orat. 12. In his notes on Eusebius (H. E. iv. 6), Valesius intimates that there was one day in the year on which the prohibition was relaxed.

XLVIII. 3. τῇ παρουσίᾳ κ. τ. λ. Compare Isai. xxxv. 5, 6, with Matt. xi. 5.

8. ἀκτῶν. *Vulgo* αὐτῷ. Although this reading may yield a meaning, yet it can never be allowed to stand against the sure emendation of Casaubon, which the

προφητικοῦ πνεύματος ἀναιρεθησόμενος ἅμα τοῖς ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἐλπίζουσιν ἀνθρώποις, ἀκούσατε τῶν λεχθέντων διὰ Ἡσαΐου. Ἔστι δὲ ταῦτα· Ἴδε ὡς ὁ δίκαιος ἀπώλετο, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐκδέχεται τῇ καρδίᾳ· καὶ ἄνδρες δίκαιοι αἴρονται, καὶ οὐδεὶς κατανοεῖ. Ἀπὸ προσώπου ἀδικίας ἦρται ὁ δίκαιος, καὶ ἔσται ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἡ ταφὴ αὐτοῦ· ἦρται ἐκ τοῦ μέσου.

Predictions of the *rejection of the Jews* and the *call of the Gentiles*; and of the danger of evil-entreating those who embrace Christianity.

XLIX. Καὶ πάλιν, πῶς δι' αὐτοῦ Ἡσαΐου λέλεκται, ὅτι οἱ οὐ προσδοκήσαντες αὐτὸν λαοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν προσκυνήσουσιν αὐτόν, οἱ δὲ ἀεὶ προσδοκῶντες Ἰουδαῖοι ἀγνοήσουσι παραγενόμενον αὐτόν. Ἐλέχθησαν δὲ οἱ λόγοι ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Εἰσὶ δὲ οὗτοι· Ἐμφανὴς ἐγενήθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν, εὑρέθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν· εἶπον, Ἰδού εἰμι, ἔθνει οἳ οὐκ ἐκάλεσαν τὸ ὄνομά μου. Ἐξεπέτασα τὰς χεῖράς μου ἐπὶ λαὸν ἀπειθοῦντα καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα, ἐπὶ τοὺς πορευομένους ἐν ὁδῷ οὐ καλῇ, ἀλλ' ὀπίσω τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν· ὁ λαὸς ὁ παροξύνων ἐναντίον μου. Ἰουδαῖοι γὰρ ἔχοντες τὰς προφητείας, καὶ ἀεὶ προσδοκήσαντες τὸν Χριστὸν παραγενησόμενον, ἠγνόησαν· οὐ μόνον δὲ, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρεχρήσαντο. Οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν, μηδέποτε μηδὲν ἀκούσαντες περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, μέχρις οὗ οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐξελθόντες ἀπόστολοι αὐτοῦ ἐμήνυσαν τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὰς προφητείας παρέδωκαν, πληρωθέντες χαρᾶς καὶ πίστεως τοῖς εἰδώλοις ἀπετάξαντο, καὶ τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ Θεῷ

text exhibits, and which is confirmed beyond any reasonable question by the similar passage in c. 35. See the note there.

11. *ἴδε ὡς ὁ δίκαιος κ. τ. λ.* From Isai. lvii. 1, 2.

XLIX. 1. *καὶ πάλιν.* *Scil.* *ἀκούσατε.*

5. *ἐμφανὴς ἐγενήθην κ. τ. λ.* From Isai. lxv. 1 sqq. Compare Rom. x. 21.

7. *ἔθνει.* MSS. *ἔθνη*, which is retained in the earlier edd. The LXX have *ἔθνει*, and so Justin in Dial. Tryph. c. 119; and in c. 24, *τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.* Collective nouns are very commonly followed by the relative in the plural, with the gender changed, *κατὰ τὸ σημαινόμενον.* See Matt. Gr. Gr. § 434. Thus, in the New Testament, Luke xix. 37, *ἤρξαντο ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν χαίροντες αἰνεῖν τὸν Θεόν.* Acts v. 16, *συνήρχετο τὸ πλῆθος, φέροντες κ. τ. λ.*

8. *ἀπειθοῦντα.* MSS. *ἀπιθοῦντα.* Most edd., however, have the error corrected. Compare cc. 35, 38; Dial. Tryph. c. 97.

10. *Ἰουδαῖοι γὰρ ἔχοντες κ. τ. λ.* Compare Acts xiii. 27, 48. Sylburg would either supply *παραγενόμενον* before *ἠγνόησαν*, or substitute it for *παραγενησόμενον.* It has also been proposed to read *διεχρήσαντο*, *they destroyed*, for *παρεχρήσαντο*, *they evil-entreated.* There is no necessity for any change.

17. *τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ Θεῷ κ. τ. λ.* Compare cc. 14, 25, 61. Grabe remarks that Justin has here adopted a form of words, with which the deacons dismissed the

διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἑαυτοὺς ἀνέθηκαν. Ὅτι δὲ προεγινώσκετο τὰ δύσφημα ταῦτα λεχθησόμενα κατὰ τῶν τὸν Χριστὸν ὁμολογούντων, καὶ ὡς εἶεν τάλανες οἱ δυσφημοῦντες αὐτὸν, καὶ τὰ παλαιὰ ἔθη καλὸν εἶναι τηρεῖν λέγοντες, ἀκούσατε τῶν βραχυεπῶς εἰρημένων διὰ Ἡσαΐου. Ἔστι δὲ ταῦτα· Οὐαὶ τοῖς λέγουσι τὸ γλυκὺ πικρὸν, καὶ τὸ πικρὸν γλυκύ.

L. Ὅτι δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν γενόμενος ἄνθρωπος, παθεῖν καὶ ἀτιμασθῆναι ὑπέμεινε, καὶ πάλιν μετὰ δόξης παραγενήσεται, ἀκούσατε τῶν εἰρημένων εἰς τοῦτο προφητειῶν. Ἔστι δὲ ταῦτα· Ἀνθ' ὧν παρέδωκαν εἰς θάνατον τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ, καὶ μετὰ τῶν ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη, αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν εἴληφε, καὶ τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐξιλάσεται. Ἰδὲ γὰρ, συνήσει ὁ παῖς μου, καὶ ὑψωθήσεται, καὶ δοξασθήσεται σφόδρα. Ὃν τρόπον ἐκστήσονται πολλοὶ ἐπὶ σὲ, οὕτως ἀδοξήσει ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων τὸ εἶδός σου, καὶ ἡ δόξα σου ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων· οὕτως θαυμάσονται ἔθνη πολλὰ, καὶ συνέξουσι βασιλεῖς τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν. Ὅτι οἷς οὐκ ἀνηγγέλη περὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ οἳ οὐκ ἀκηκόασι, συνήσουσι. Κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσε τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν; καὶ ὁ βραχίων κυρίου τίνι ἀπεκαλύφθη; Ἀνηγγείλαμεν ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ὡς παιδίον, ὡς ῥίζα ἐν γῇ διψώσῃ. Οὐκ ἔστιν εἶδος αὐτῷ, οὐδὲ δόξα· καὶ εἴδομεν αὐτὸν, καὶ οὐκ εἶχεν εἶδος οὐδὲ κάλλος, ἀλλὰ τὸ εἶδος αὐτοῦ ἄτιμον καὶ ἐκλεῖπον παρὰ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. Ἄνθρωπος ἐν πληγῇ ὢν, καὶ εἰδὼς φέρειν μαλακίαν, ὅτι ἀπέστραπται τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ, ἠτιμάσθη καὶ οὐκ ἐλογίσθη. Οὗτος τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει, καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν ὀδυνᾶται, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐλογισάμεθα αὐτὸν εἶναι ἐν πόνῳ, καὶ ἐν πληγῇ καὶ ἐν κακώσει. Αὐτὸς δὲ ἐτραυματίσθη διὰ τὰς ἀνομίας ἡμῶν, καὶ μεμαλάκισται διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας

Isaiah's prophecy of the *death* and *passion* of the incarnate Redeemer.

catechumens, whom they were preparing for admission into the church by baptism. It is thus given in the Constt. Apost. VIII. 6, *ἑαυτοὺς τῷ μόνῳ ἀγεννήτῳ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ παράθεσθε.*

23. *οὐαὶ τοῖς λέγουσι κ. τ. λ.* From Isai. v. 20. Justin's application of the prophecy is somewhat arbitrary.

L. 4. *ἀνθ' ὧν παρέδωκαν κ. τ. λ.* This first clause of the prophecy is from Isai. liii. 12. The continuation, *ἴδε γαρ κ. τ. λ.*, is from Isai. lii. 13—liii. 8.

12. *περὶ αὐτοῦ.* Thirlby suggests that *ὄψονται*, which is found in the LXX, has been omitted by the carelessness of transcribers; for the verb appears in the passage, as cited twice again by Justin in Dial. Tryph. cc. 13, 118.

ἡμῶν· παιδεία εἰρήνης ἐπ' αὐτόν, τῷ μώλωπι αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς ἰάθημεν. Πάντες ὡς πρόβατα ἐπλανήθημεν· ἄνθρωπος τῇ ὁδῷ αὐτοῦ ἐπλανήθη. Καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν, καὶ αὐτὸς διὰ τὸ κεκακῶσθαι οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ. Ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγὴν ἤχθη, καὶ ὡς ἀμνὸς ἐναντίον τοῦ κείροντος αὐτὸν ἄφωνος, οὕτως οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ. Ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει αὐτοῦ ἡ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ἤρθη. —Μετὰ οὖν τὸ σταυρωθῆναι αὐτὸν καὶ οἱ γνώριμοι αὐτοῦ πάντες ἀπέστησαν, ἀρνησάμενοι αὐτόν· ὕστερον δέ, ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάντος, καὶ ὀφθέντος αὐτοῖς, καὶ ταῖς προφητείαις ἐντυχεῖν, ἐν αἷς πάντα ταῦτα προείρητο γενησόμενα, διδάξαντος, καὶ εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνερχόμενον ἰδόντες, καὶ πιστεύσαντες, καὶ δύναμιν ἐκεῖθεν αὐτοῖς πεμφθεῖσαν παρ' αὐτοῦ λαβόντες, καὶ εἰς πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων ἐλθόντες, ταῦτα ἐδίδαξαν, καὶ ἀπόστολοι προσηγορεύθησαν.

Prophecies respecting the *origin* of Christ, his *ascension into heaven*, and his *coming again with glory*.

LI. Ἵνα δὲ μηνύσῃ ἡμῖν τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα, ὅτι ὁ ταῦτα πάσχων ἀνεκδιήγητον ἔχει τὸ γένος, καὶ βασιλεύει τῶν ἐχθρῶν, ἔφη οὕτως· Τὴν γενεὰν αὐτοῦ τίς διηγήσεται; ὅτι αἴρεται ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ· ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν ἥκει εἰς θάνατον. Καὶ δώσω τοὺς πονηροὺς ἀντὶ τῆς ταφῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοὺς πλουσίους ἀντὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ· ὅτι ἀνομίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ εὑρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ. Καὶ κύριος βούλεται καθαρίσαι αὐτὸν τῆς πληγῆς. Ἐὰν δῶται περὶ ἁμαρτίας, ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν ὄψεται σπέρμα μακρόβιον. Καὶ βούλεται κύριος ἀφελεῖν ἀπὸ πόνου τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ, δεῖξαι αὐτῷ φῶς, καὶ πλάσαι τῇ συνέσει, δικαιῶσαι δίκαιον εὖ δουλεύοντα πολλοῖς. Καὶ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνοίσει. Διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸς κληρονομήσει πολλούς, καὶ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν μεριεῖ σκῦλα· ἀνθ' ὧν παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη, καὶ αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκε, καὶ διὰ τὰς ἀνομίας αὐτῶν αὐτὸς παρεδόθη. Ὡς δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἔμελλεν ἀνιέναι, καθὼς προεφητεύθη, ἀκούσατε. Ἐλέχθη δὲ οὕτως·

24. εἰρήνης. The LXX adds ἡμῶν, and so Justin in Dial. Tryph. c. 13.

31. μετὰ οὖν τὸ σταυρωθῆναι αὐτὸν κ. τ. λ. See Matt. xxviii. 17; Mark xvi. 11, 13; Luke xxiv. 25 sqq.; John xx. 24 sqq.; Acts i. 8 sqq.

LI. 2. βασιλεύει. Thirlby would read βασιλεύσει, in the future: but a prophetic present requires no alteration.

3. τὴν γενεὰν αὐτοῦ κ. τ. λ. From Isai. liii. 8 sqq.

Ἄρατε πύλας οὐρανῶν, ἀνοίχθητε, ἵνα εἰσέλθῃ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης. Τίς ἐστιν οὗτος ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης; Κύριος κραταιὸς καὶ κύριος δυνατός. Ὡς δὲ καὶ ἐξ οὐρανῶν παραγίνεσθαι μετὰ δόξης μέλλει, ἀκούσατε καὶ τῶν εἰρημένων εἰς τοῦτο διὰ Ἱερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου. Ἔστι δὲ ταῦτα· Ἰδοὺ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται ἐπάνω τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ σὺν αὐτῷ.

From the partial fulfilment of prophecy, it may be reasonably inferred that what is yet unfulfilled will eventually be accomplished; and thus the *first advent* of Christ in *humility* is an earnest of his *second coming* in *glory*.

LII. Ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν τὰ γενόμενα ἤδη πάντα ἀποδείκνυμεν, πρὶν ἢ γενέσθαι, προκεκηρύχθαι διὰ τῶν προφητῶν, ἀνάγκη καὶ περὶ τῶν ὁμοίως προφητευθέντων, μελλόντων δὲ γίνεσθαι, πίστιν ἔχειν ὡς πάντως γενησομένων. Ὃν γὰρ τρόπον τὰ ἤδη γενόμενα, προκεκηρυγμένα καὶ ἀγνοούμενα, ἀπέβη, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ τὰ λείποντα, κἂν ἀγνοῆται καὶ ἀπιστῆται, ἀποβήσονται. Δύο γὰρ αὐτοῦ παρουσίας προεκήρυξαν οἱ προφῆται· μίαν μὲν τὴν ἤδη γενομένην, ὡς ἀτίμου καὶ παθητοῦ ἀνθρώπου· τὴν δὲ δευτέραν, ὅταν μετὰ δόξης ἐξ οὐρανῶν μετὰ τῆς ἀγγελικῆς αὐτοῦ στρατιᾶς παραγενήσεσθαι κεκήρυκται, ὅτε καὶ τὰ σώματα ἀνεγερεῖ πάντων τῶν γενομένων ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τῶν μὲν ἀξίων ἐνδύσει ἀφθαρσίαν, τῶν δ' ἀδίκων ἐν αἰσθήσει αἰωνίᾳ μετὰ τῶν φαύλων δαιμόνων εἰς τὸ αἰώνιον πῦρ πέμψει. Ὡς δὲ καὶ ταῦτα προείρηται γενησόμενα, δηλώσομεν. Ἐρρήθη δὲ διὰ Ἰεζεκιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου οὕτως· Συναχθήσεται ἁρμονία

19. *ἄρατε πύλας κ. τ. λ.* From Ps. xxiv. 7, 8.

23. *διὰ Ἱερεμίου.* This prophecy is found, not in *Jeremiah*, but in Dan. vii. 13. Compare Matt. xxv. 31.

LII. 1. *ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν κ. τ. λ.* Tertull. Apol. c. 20, *Hinc apud nos futurorum quoque fides tuta est, jam scilicet probatorum, quia cum illis, quæ quotidie probantur, prædicebantur.* Compare Theophil. ad Autol. II. 9; Pseudo-Clem. Hom. II. 10.

7. *ἀπιστῆται.* So Cod. Clar. The Cod. Reg. and earlier edd. have *ἀπιστεῖται.* Of the confusion between *η* and *ει* there are frequent instances in the MSS. One has been already noticed in c. 49; and a few lines onwards the vulgar reading *ἐνδύσῃ* had been properly corrected into *ἐνδύσει* by Thalemann, Braunius, and Otto, at the suggestion of the Benedictine editor.

7. *δύο γὰρ αὐτοῦ παρουσίας κ. τ. λ.* Compare Dial. Tryph. cc. 14, 32, 49, 52. See also Iren. Hær. IV. 56.

9. *παθητοῦ.* Properly this verbal signifies *passible*, or *capable of suffering*; but here, as in Acts xxvi. 23, it means *doomed to suffer*. So again in Dial. Tryph. c. 89, *παθητὸν μὲν τὸν Χριστὸν ὅτι αἱ γραφαὶ κηρύσσουσι, φανερόν ἐστι.* Compare Luke xxiv. 25.

12. *τῶν μὲν ἀξίων. Scil. σώματα.*

16. *συναχθήσεται ἁρμονίᾳ κ. τ. λ.* From Ezek. xxxvii. 7, 8. The next clause, *καὶ πᾶν γόνυ κ. τ. λ.*, is from Isai. xlv. 23. Compare Rom. xiv. 11.

πρὸς ἁρμονίαν, καὶ ὀστέον πρὸς ὀστέον, καὶ σάρκες ἀναφυήσονται· καὶ πᾶν γόνυ κάμψει τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται αὐτῷ. Ἐν οἵᾳ δὲ αἰσθήσει καὶ κολάσει γενέσθαι μέλλουσιν οἱ ἄδικοι, ἀκούσατε τῶν ὁμοίως εἰς τοῦτο εἰρημένων. Ἔστι δὲ ταῦτα· Ὁ σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ παυθήσεται, καὶ τὸ πῦρ αὐτῶν οὐ σβεσθήσεται· καὶ τότε μετανοήσουσιν, ὅτε οὐδὲν ὠφελήσουσιν. Ποῖα δὲ μέλλουσιν οἱ λαοὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων λέγειν καὶ ποιεῖν, ὅταν ἴδωσιν αὐτὸν ἐν δόξῃ παραγενόμενον, διὰ Ζαχαρίου τοῦ προφήτου προφητευθέντα ἐλέχθη οὕτως· Εντελοῦμαι τοῖς τέσσαρσιν ἀνέμοις συνάξαι τὰ ἐσκορπισμένα τέκνα· ἐντελοῦμαι τῷ βοῤῥᾷ φέρειν, καὶ τῷ νότῳ μὴ προσκόπτειν. Καὶ τότε ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ κοπετὸς μέγας, οὐ κοπετὸς στομάτων ἢ χειλέων, ἀλλὰ κοπετὸς καρδίας· καὶ οὐ μὴ σχίσωσιν αὐτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια, ἀλλὰ τὰς διανοίας. Κόψονται φυλὴ πρὸς φυλήν, καὶ τότε ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν, καὶ ἐροῦσι, Τί, κύριε, ἐπλάνησας ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ σου; ἡ δόξα, ἣν εὐλόγησαν οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν, ἐγενήθη ἡμῖν εἰς ὄνειδος.

Convinced by the fulfilment of prophecy passing before their eyes, Christians believe without hesitation in a crucified Saviour: and the greater number of Gentile converts than those from the Jews and Samaritans, having been also predicted, tends to confirm their faith.

LIII. Πολλὰς μὲν οὖν καὶ ἑτέρας προφητείας ἔχοντες εἰπεῖν ἐπαυσάμεθα, αὐτάρκεις καὶ ταύτας εἰς πεισμονὴν τοῖς τὰ ἀκουστικὰ καὶ νοερὰ ὦτα ἔχουσιν εἶναι λογισάμενοι, καὶ νοεῖν δύνασθαι αὐτοὺς ἡγούμενοι, ὅτι οὐχ ὁμοίως τοῖς μυθοποιηθεῖσι περὶ τῶν νομισθέντων υἱῶν τοῦ Διὸς καὶ ἡμεῖς μόνον λέγομεν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀποδεῖξαι ἔχομεν. Τίνι γὰρ ἂν λόγῳ ἀνθρώπῳ σταυρωθέντι ἐπειθόμεθα, ὅτι πρωτότοκος τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ Θεῷ ἐστι, καὶ αὐτὸς τὴν κρίσιν τοῦ παντὸς ἀνθρωπείου γένους ποιήσεται, εἰ μὴ μαρτύρια, πρὶν ἢ

21. ὁ σκώληξ κ. τ. λ. From Isai. lxvi. 24. For παυθήσεται, the LXX have τελευτήσει, and so it is cited in Dial. Tryph. c. 54. Compare, however, c. 140. See also Mark ix. 44, and compare Ecclus. vii. 17; Judith xvii. 17.

22. καὶ τότε μετανοήσουσιν, ὅτε οὐδ. ὠφ. Bp. Pearson asks, *An hoc quasi ex propheta?*

25. διὰ Ζαχαρίου. The citations which follow are not from Zechariah exclusively, but partly from Isaiah, and not very accurately transcribed. See Zech. ii. 6; xii. 2, 10, 12; Isai. lxiii. 17; lxiv. 11. Compare also Isai. xi. 12; xliii. 5, 6; Joel ii. 13.

LIII. 2. ἐπαυσάμεθα. Codd. Reg. et Clar. in marg. παυόμεθα.

7. πρωτότοκος τῷ ἀγ. Θ. So in c. 21, πρῶτον γέννημα τοῦ Θεοῦ. See also Dial. Tryph. cc. 84, 85, 100, 125, 138; and compare Coloss. i. 15, 17.

8. αὐτὸς τὴν κρίσιν κ. τ. λ. Compare c. 8, 13.

ἐλθεῖν αὐτὸν ἄνθρωπον γενόμενον, κεκηρυγμένα περὶ αὐτοῦ εὕρομεν, καὶ οὕτως γενόμενα ὁρῶμεν, γῆς μὲν Ἰουδαίων ἐρήμωσιν, καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔθνους ἀνθρώπων διὰ τῆς παρὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ διδαχῆς πεισθέντας, καὶ παραιτησαμένους τὰ παλαιά, ἐν οἷς πλανώμενοι ἀνεστράφησαν, ἔθη, ἑαυτοὺς ἡμᾶς ὁρῶντες, πλείονάς τε καὶ ἀληθεστέρους τοὺς ἐξ ἐθνῶν τῶν ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων καὶ Σαμαρέων Χριστιανοὺς εἰδότες; Τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλα πάντα γένη ἀνθρώπεια ὑπὸ τοῦ προφητικοῦ πνεύματος καλεῖται ἔθνη· τὸ δὲ Ἰουδαϊκὸν καὶ Σαμαρειτικὸν φῦλον Ἰσραὴλ καὶ οἶκος Ἰακὼβ κέκληνται. Ὡς δὲ προεφητεύθη ὅτι πλείονες οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν πιστεύοντες τῶν ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων καὶ Σαμαρέων, τὰ προφητευθέντα ἀπαγγελοῦμεν. Ἐλέχθη δὲ οὕτως· Εὐφράνθητι στεῖρα ἡ οὐ τίκτουσα, ῥῆξον καὶ βόησον ἡ οὐκ ὠδίνουσα, ὅτι πολλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐρήμου μᾶλλον, ἢ τῆς ἐχούσης τὸν ἄνδρα. Ἔρημα γὰρ ἦν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἀληθινοῦ Θεοῦ, χειρῶν ἔργοις λατρεύοντα· Ἰουδαῖοι δὲ καὶ Σαμαρεῖς ἔχοντες τὸν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον διὰ τῶν προφητῶν παραδοθέντα αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἀεὶ προσδοκήσαντες τὸν Χριστόν, παραγενόμενον ἠγνόησαν, πλὴν ὀλίγων τινῶν, οὓς προεῖπε τὸ ἅγιον προφητικὸν πνεῦμα διὰ Ἡσαΐου σωθήσεσθαι. Εἶπε δὲ ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν· Εἰ μὴ κύριος ἐγκατέλιπεν ἡμῖν σπέρμα, ὡς Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα ἂν ἐγενήθημεν. Σόδομα γὰρ καὶ Γόμορρα πόλεις τινὲς ἀσεβῶν ἀνδρῶν ἱστοροῦνται ὑπὸ Μωσέως γενόμεναι, ἃς πυρὶ καὶ θείῳ καύσας ὁ Θεὸς κατέστρεψε, μηδενὸς τῶν ἐν αὐταῖς σωθέντος, πλὴν ἀλλοέθνους τινός, Χαλδαίου τὸ γένος, ᾧ ὄνομα Λώτ· σὺν ᾧ καὶ θυγατέρες διεσώθησαν. Καὶ τὴν πᾶσαν αὐτῶν χώραν ἔρημον καὶ κεκαυμένην οὖσαν, καὶ ἄγονον μένουσαν, οἱ βουλόμενοι ὁρᾶν ἔχουσιν. Ὡς δὲ καὶ ἀληθέστεροι οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν καὶ πιστότεροι προεγινώσκοντο, ἀπαγγελοῦμεν

15. ἔθη. Cod. Clar. ἔθνη.

22. εὐφράνθητι στεῖρα κ. τ. λ. From Isai. liv. 1. Compare Gal. iv. 27.

31. εἰ μὴ κύριος κ. τ. λ. Slightly varied from Isai. i. 9. LXX. Compare Dial. Tryph. c. 140.

34. ὑπὸ Μωσέως. See Gen. xix.

38. κεκαυμένην οὖσαν, καὶ ἄγ. μ. Tertul. Apol. c. 40, *Olet adhuc incendio terra, et signa illic arborum poma oriantur oculis tenus, ceterum contacta concrescunt.* Compare Tacit. Hist. v. 7; Augustin. C. D. xxi. 8.

τὰ εἰρημένα διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου. Ἔφη δὲ οὕτως· Ἰσραὴλ ἀπερίτμητος τὴν καρδίαν, τὰ δὲ ἔθνη τὴν ἀκροβυστίαν. Τὰ τοσαῦτα γοῦν ὁρώμενα πειθὼ καὶ πίστιν τοῖς τἀληθὲς ἀσπαζομένοις, καὶ μὴ φιλοδοξοῦσι, μηδὲ ὑπὸ παθῶν ἀρχομένοις, μετὰ λόγου ἐμφορῆσαι δύναται.

Justin now enters upon the proof of his third position, that the dæmons, with a view to undermine the credibility of the Gospel, perverted the prophecies of Scripture concerning Christ into materials for the frame-work of the Heathen Mythology.

LIV. Οἱ δὲ παραδιδόντες τὰ μυθοποιηθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν ποιητῶν, οὐδεμίαν ἀπόδειξιν φέρουσι τοῖς ἐκμανθάνουσι νέοις· καὶ ἐπὶ ἀπάτῃ καὶ ἀπαγωγῇ τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου γένους εἰρῆσθαι ἀποδείκνυμεν κατ' ἐνέργειαν τῶν φαύλων δαιμόνων. Ἀκούσαντες γὰρ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν κηρυσσόμενον παραγενησόμενον τὸν Χριστὸν, καὶ κολασθησομένους διὰ πυρὸς τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, προεβάλλοντο πολλοὺς λεχθῆναι γενομένους υἱοὺς τῷ Διΐ, νομίζοντες δυνήσεσθαι ἐνεργῆσαι τερατολογίαν ἡγήσασθαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τὰ περὶ τὸν Χριστὸν, καὶ ὅμοια τοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν ποιητῶν λεχθεῖσι. Καὶ ταῦτα δ' ἐλέχθη καὶ ἐν Ἕλλησιν καὶ ἐν ἔθνεσι πᾶσιν, ὅπου μᾶλλον ἐπήκουον τῶν προφητῶν πιστευθήσεσθαι τὸν Χριστὸν προκηρυσσόντων. Ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἀκούοντες τὰ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν λεγόμενα, οὐκ ἐνόουν ἀκριβῶς, ἀλλ' ὡς

42. τὴν ἀκροβυστίαν. *Scil.* ἀπερίτμητα. This prophecy is not found in Isaiah, but in Jerem. ix. 26.

45. ἐμφορῆσαι. *Durum in hac re verbum. Solenne est* ἐμποιῆσαι. THALEMANN.

LIV. 4. ἀποδείκνυμεν. *We* proceed to *demonstrate*. See above, on c. 23, 10; 14.

7. λεχθῆναι γενομένους. The MSS. and most edd. have λεγομένους, which Grabe renders *above-mentioned*, i.e. by Justin in c. 21, referring λεχθῆναι to the mythologists, as influenced by the dæmons. It is scarcely possible, however, that Justin should have expressed himself at once so harshly and ambiguously. Thalemann therefore professes either to cancel λεχθῆναι, or read τεχθῆναι instead: but both conjectures are equally set aside by the similar mode of speaking, which is almost immediately employed in the words τὸν Περσέα λεχθῆναι προεβάλλοντο. Neither did the dæmons contrive the *birth* of these sons of Jupiter, but the invention of the fables respecting them. By reading γενομένους, with reference to τῷ Διΐ in the dative, the text is easily and, it should seem, surely emended. Otto was the first who adopted the change, though it had been previously suggested by Braunius.

10. ὅμοια. So Braunius and Otto, after Thirlby. *Vulgo* ὁμοίως.

14. οὐκ ἐνόουν ἀκριβῶς κ. τ. λ. Although the Fathers agree, for the most part, in ascribing to the dæmons a high degree of intelligence and foresight, they stop short with Justin, and deny them the gift of absolute foreknowledge. Thus Theodoret. Comm. in Ezek. xxi., προσήκει εἰδέναι, ὅτι τῶν ἐσομένων οὐδὲν οἱ δαίμονες ἴσασι, καταστοχαζόμενοι δὲ τῶν πραγμάτων προλέγειν ἐπιχειροῦσι·

πλανώμενοι ἐμιμήσαντο τὰ περὶ τὸν ἡμέτερον Χριστὸν, διασαφήσομεν. Μωσῆς οὖν ὁ προφήτης, ὡς προέφημεν, πρεσβύτερος ἦν πάντων συγγραφέων, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ, ὡς προεμηνύσαμεν, προεφητεύθη οὕτως· Οὐκ ἐκλείψει ἄρχων ἐξ Ἰούδα, καὶ ἡγούμενος ἐκ τῶν μηρῶν αὐτοῦ, ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ ᾧ ἀπόκειται· καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται προσδοκία ἐθνῶν, δεσμεύων πρὸς ἄμπελον τὸν πῶλον αὐτοῦ, πλύνων τὴν στολὴν αὐτοῦ ἐν αἵματι σταφυλῆς. Τούτων οὖν τῶν προφητικῶν λόγων ἀκούσαντες οἱ δαίμονες, Διόνυσον μὲν ἔφασαν γεγονέναι υἱὸν τοῦ Διὸς, εὑρετὴν δὲ γενέσθαι ἀμπέλου παρέδωκαν, καὶ ὄνον ἐν τοῖς μυστηρίοις αὐτοῦ

He instances in the fables of *Bacchus*, *Bellerophon*, *Perseus*, *Hercules*, and *Esculapius*.

καὶ ἔστι μὲν ὅτι καθευθὺ φέρονται, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ διαμαρτάνουσι. Lactant. Instt. Div. II. 14, *Sciunt illi quidem futura multa, sed non omnia, quippe quibus penitus consilium Dei scire non licet, et ideo solent responsa in ambiguos exitus temperare.* Compare Pseudo-Clem. Recogn. IV. 21; Herm. Past. II. 10; Origen. c. Cels. IV. 92; Tertull. Apol. c. 22; Minuc. F. Oct. c. 27; Cyprian. de Idol. Ven. c. 7.

16. ὡς προέφημεν. Namely, in c. 44.

17. ὡς προεμηνύσαμεν. In c. 32.

20. ᾧ ἀπόκειται. *Vulgo* ὅ. See above, on c. 32, 3.

25. ὄνον. So Edd. Morell. and Ott. The emendation is also approved, though not received into the text, by Grabe, Thirlby, and Braunius. In the MSS. and most edd. the reading is οἶνον, which the Benedictine editor defends, under the impression, that as Justin cites and understands the prediction of Jacob (Gen. xlix. 10 sq.), he could not have argued that the *ass* was thence consecrated to Bacchus at the instigation of the dæmons: whereas, on the other hand, the use of *wine* was well known to be essential in the celebration of his mysteries. It is true, indeed, that in quoting the passage *memoriter* from the LXX, he has omitted the words καὶ τῇ ἕλικι τὸν πῶλον τῆς ὄνου αὐτοῦ, which there occurs after τὸν πῶλον αὐτοῦ. At the same time it is evident that the omission is a mere *lapsus memoriæ*, inasmuch as they are correctly inserted in a quotation of the same prophecy in the Dial. Tryph. c. 52; though they are again overlooked in an argument parallel with the present in c. 69. In this latter passage too the reading of the MSS. and edd. is οἶνον. Still it is manifest from the plain tenor of Justin's argument, that ὄνον alone can have been written by him. Though, by reason of his forgetfulness of the omitted clause, he has strangely attributed to the dæmons a doubt whether the *foal* mentioned was that of an *ass* or a *horse*, he makes that very doubt the motive of their consecrating the one to Bacchus, and sending Bellerophon to heaven on the other; so that, in either case, they might not fail of a myth adapted to their purpose. That the ass was sacred to Bacchus, is sufficiently ascertained. Thus Phurnut. de N. D. p. 77, (ed. Ald.): οἱ ὄνοι ἐν ταῖς πομπαῖς αὐτοῦ (*Dionysi*) θαμίζουσι. Plin. N. H. XXIV. 1, *Ferulæ asinis gratissimo sunt in pabulo, cæteris vero jumentis præsentaneo veneno; qua de causa id animal Libero patri adsignatur, cui et ferula.* For ἀναγράφουσι, it has been proposed to read ἀναφέρουσι or ἀνάγουσι. No change is required. In Dial. c. 69, the corresponding verb is παραφέρωσιν.

ἀναγράφουσι, καὶ διασπαραχθέντα αὐτὸν ἀνεληλυθέναι εἰς οὐρανὸν ἐδίδαξαν. Καὶ ἐπειδὴ διὰ τῆς Μωσέως προφητείας οὐ ῥητῶς ἐσημαίνετο, εἴ τε υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ παραγενησόμενός ἐστι, καὶ εἰ ὀχούμενος ἐπὶ πώλου ἐπὶ γῆς μενεῖ ἢ εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνελεύσεται, καὶ τὸ τοῦ πώλου ὄνομα καὶ ὄνου πῶλον καὶ ἵππου σημαίνειν ἐδύνατο, μὴ ἐπιστάμενοι εἴτε ὄνου πῶλον ἄγων ἔσται σύμβολον τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ, εἴτε ἵππου, ὁ προκηρυσσόμενος, καὶ υἱὸς Θεοῦ ἐστιν, ὡς προέφημεν, ἢ ἀνθρώπου, τὸν Βελλεροφόντην καὶ αὐτὸν ἐφ' ἵππου Πηγάσου, ἄνθρωπον ἐξ ἀνθρώπου γενόμενον, εἰς οὐρανὸν ἔφασαν ἀνεληλυθέναι. Ὅτε δὲ ἤκουσαν διὰ τοῦ ἄλλου προφήτου Ἡσαΐου λεχθὲν, ὅτι διὰ παρθένου τεχθήσεται, καὶ δι' ἑαυτοῦ ἀνελεύσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, τὸν Περσέα λεχθῆναι προεβάλλοντο. Καὶ ὅτε ἔγνωσαν εἰρημένον, ὡς προλέλεκται ἐν ταῖς προγεγραμμέναις προφητείαις, Ἰσχυρὸς ὡς γίγας δραμεῖν ὁδὸν, τὸν Ἡρακλέα ἰσχυρὸν καὶ ἐκπερινοστήσαντα τὴν πᾶσαν γῆν ἔφασαν. Ὅτε δὲ πάλιν ἔμαθον προφητευθέντα θεραπεύσειν αὐτὸν πᾶσαν νόσον, καὶ νεκροὺς ἀνεγερεῖν, τὸν Ἀσκληπιὸν παρήνεγκαν.

32. *ἄγων ἔσται.* For *ἄξει.* In the later Greek the participle and auxiliary is very frequently used for the finite verb; and yet there is probably here some latent error in the text. Among other unsatisfactory emendations, Thirlby suggests, but with little confidence, *ἄγων ἕξει.* Would *ἅγιον ἕξει σύμβολον,* or *ἄγων ἥξει,* be more probable?—In the next clause Thirlby also mentions *καὶ εἰ υἱὸς Θεοῦ ἐστὶν,* as a possible, but not necessary, reading.

34. *ὡς προέφημεν.* The reference is to c. 21. By a comparison with what is there written, it will appear probable that Otto is right in supposing that *ἐξ ἀνθρώπων* is the true reading here, instead of *ἐξ ἀνθρώπου.* Compare Dial. Tryph. cc. 48, 49. See also above, c. 21, 13.

37. *διὰ Ἡσαΐου.* Isai. vii. 14. See above, c. 22, and compare Dial. Tryph. c. 70. Davies would here read, as in the Dialogue, *Περσέα τεχθῆναι ἐκ παρθένου καὶ πτηρωθῆναι προεβάλλοντο.* Otherwise he would cancel *λεχθῆναι,* which Thalemann would simply alter into *τεχθῆναι.* *Inutilis labor!* exclaims *Otto.* See on l. 7, *supra.*

41. *ἰσχυρὸς ὡς γ. δ. ὁδόν.* From Ps. xix. 5. It will be observed, however, that although the main force of Justin's inference lies in the word *ἰσχυρὸς,* that word is neither found in the text itself, nor in a various reading, nor in the passage as before cited in c. 40. In Dial. Tryph. c. 69, it again appears to support the same argument.

44. *τὸν Ἀσκληπιὸν παρήνεγκαν.* Compare c. 21; Dial. Tryph. c. 69.

The dæmons, however, entertained no notion that the Messiah was to be crucified, and therefore devised no fables relating to the crucifixion. At the same time the universal prevalence of the figure of the cross, both in natural and artificial objects, indicates its importance.

LV. Ἀλλ' οὐδαμοῦ οὐδ' ἐπί τινος τῶν λεγομένων υἱῶν τοῦ Διὸς τὸ σταυρωθῆναι ἐμιμήσαντο· οὐ γὰρ ἐνοεῖτο αὐτοῖς, συμβολικῶς, ὡς προδεδήλωται, τῶν εἰς τοῦτο εἰρημένων πάντων λελεγμένων. Ὅπερ, ὡς προεῖπεν ὁ προφήτης, τὸ μέγιστον σύμβολον τῆς ἰσχύος καὶ ἀρχῆς αὐτοῦ ὑπάρχει, ὡς καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὑπ' ὄψιν πιπτόντων δείκνυται. Κατανοήσατε γὰρ πάντα τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, εἰ ἄνευ τοῦ σχήματος τούτου διοικεῖται, ἢ κοινωνίαν ἔχειν δύναται. Θάλασσα μὲν γὰρ οὐ τέμνεται, ἢν μὴ τοῦτο τὸ τρόπαιον, ὃ καλεῖται ἱστίον, ἐν τῇ νηῒ σῶον μείνῃ· γῆ δὲ οὐκ ἀροῦται ἄνευ αὐτοῦ· σκαπανεῖς δὲ τὴν ἐργασίαν οὐ ποιοῦνται, οὐδὲ βαναυσουργοὶ ὁμοίως, εἰ μὴ διὰ τῶν τὸ σχῆμα τοῦτο ἐχόντων ἐργαλείων. Τὸ δὲ ἀνθρώπειον σχῆμα οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ τῶν ἀλόγων ζώων διαφέρει, ἢ τῷ ὀρθόν τε εἶναι, καὶ ἔκτασιν χειρῶν ἔχειν, καὶ ἐν τῷ προσώπῳ ἀπὸ τοῦ μετωπίου τεταμένον τὸν λεγόμενον μυξωτῆρα φέρειν, δι' οὗ ἥ τε ἀναπνοή ἐστι τῷ ζώῳ, καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο δείκνυσιν ἢ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ σταυροῦ. Καὶ διὰ τοῦ προφήτου δὲ ἐλέχθη οὕτως· Πνεῦμα πρὸ προσώπου

LV. 3. ὡς προδεδήλωται. See above, c. 35.

8. θάλασσα μὲν γὰρ κ. τ. λ. So Minuc. F. Octav. c. 29, *Cruces nec colimus nec horremus. Vos plane, qui ligneos deos consecratis, cruces ligneas, ut deorum vestrorum partes, forsitan adoratis. Nam et* signa ipsa et cantabra et vexilla castrorum, *quid aliud quam inaccuratæ cruces sunt et ornatæ? Tropæa vestra victricia non tantum simplicis crucis faciem, verum et adfixi hominis imitantur. Signum sane crucis naturaliter visimus in navi, cum velis tumentibus vehitur, cum expansis palmulis labitur; et cum erigitur jugum, crucis signum est; et cum homo porrectis manibus Deum pura mente veneratur. Ita signo crucis aut ratio naturalis innititur, aut vestra religio formatur.* Tertul. ad Nat. I. 12, *Ipsi quoque corpori nostro tacita et secreta linea crucis situs est; quod caput emicat, quod spina dirigitur, &c., si statueres hominem manibus expansis, imaginem crucis feceris.—In victoriis cruces colit castrensis religio.—Sic etiam* in cantabris atque vexillis, *quæ non minore sanctitate militia custodit, siphara illa vestes crucum sunt.* Again, in Apol. c. 16, *Religio Romanorum tota castrensis signa veneratur, signa jurat, signa omnibus diis præponit. Domus illi imaginum suggestus in signis monilia crucum sunt: siphara illa* vexillorum et cantabrorum *stolæ crucum sunt.* Compare also Justin. Dial. Tryph. cc. 90, 91, 105; Barnab. Epist. c. 12; Tertull. adv. Marc. III. 18; Adv. Jud. c. 10; Prudent. Peristeph. x. 621 sqq. Such notions may appear sufficiently fanciful; but they would scarcely have been urged by such writers as Justin and Tertullian, unless they knew that some weight would be attached to them by those whom they addressed.

18. πνεῦμα πρὸ προσώπου ἡμῶν Χ. κ. From Lament. iv. 20, according to the LXX, except that the preposition is omitted before προσώπου. Hence, in Tertull. c. Prax. c. 14, *Spiritus personæ ejus Christus Dominus.* Compare Iren. Hær.

ἡμῶν Χριστὸς κύριος. Καὶ τὰ παρ' ὑμῖν δὲ σύμβολα τὴν τοῦ σχήματος τούτου δύναμιν δηλοῖ τῶν καλουμένων βηξίλλων καὶ τῶν τροπαίων, δι' ὧν αἵ τε πρόοδοι ὑμῶν πανταχοῦ γίνονται, τῆς ἀρχῆς καὶ δυνάμεως τὰ σημεῖα ἐν τούτοις δεικνύντες, εἰ καὶ μὴ νοοῦντες τοῦτο πράττετε. Καὶ τῶν παρ' ὑμῖν ἀποθνησκόντων αὐτοκρατόρων τὰς εἰκόνας ἐπὶ τούτῳ σχήματι ἀνατίθετε, καὶ θεοὺς διὰ γραμμάτων ἐπονομάζετε. Καὶ διὰ λόγου οὖν καὶ σχήματος τοῦ φαινομένου, ὅση δύναμις, προτρεψάμενοι ὑμᾶς, ἀνεύθυνοι οἴδαμεν λοιπὸν ὄντες, κἂν ὑμεῖς ἀπιστεῖτε· τὸ γὰρ ἡμέτερον γέγονε καὶ πεπέρανται.

As before the birth of Christ, they devised the mythologies of heathenism; so these dæmons afterwards raised up heretics, as Simon and Menander, to seduce mankind from the truth by lying wonders.

LVI. Οὐκ ἠρκέσθησαν δὲ οἱ φαῦλοι δαίμονες πρὸ τῆς φανερώσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰπεῖν τοὺς λεχθέντας υἱοὺς τῷ Διΐ γεγονέναι· ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ, φανερωθέντος αὐτοῦ καὶ

III. 10, 4; Tertul. c. Marc. III. 6. The text is quoted in the same form as by Justin in the Constt. Apost. v. 20. According to the Hebrew, the translation should not have been Χριστὸς κύριος, but *the Anointed* of *the Lord;* and Zedekiah, king of Judah, is in all probability meant. It is clearly upon the LXX version alone that the mythic sense, in which Justin and some other Fathers have applied it, can be built.

19. τὰ παρ' ὑμῖν. Ed. Steph. ἡμῖν, which is doubtless a misprint.

20. τῶν καλουμένων βηξίλλων. In the MSS. and in the edd. prior to that of Otto, there is a *lacuna*, between δηλοῖ and καὶ τῶν τροπαίων, which leaves a space sufficient for about four or five syllables, and contains only the broken word λλωμεν. To supply the deficiency various conjectures have been proposed, such as ἐν πολέμῳ καὶ τῶν τ., τῶν σημείων καὶ τ. τ., τῶν ἄλλων τε καὶ τ. τ., or τῶν λαβάρων τε καὶ τ. τ., by Sylburg and others. Thirlby, who had previously suggested οὐηξίλλωμεν κ. τ. τ., finding that in the Cod. Clar. the letters βιξι were supplied by a different hand before λλωμεν, and making allowance for the length of the hiatus, hit upon the following very plausible supplement—λέγω δὲ τὰ τῶν καλουμένων παρ' ὑμῖν βιξίλλων. Now this latter word, which is the Latin *vexillum* in Greek characters, appears under the different forms βίξιλλον, βέξιλλον, and βήξιλλον, of which the latter is preferred by Otto; and, as the suggestion of Thirlby is somewhat too long for the break in the MS., the Benedictine emendation, as adopted by the same editor, has been continued in the text. Its correctness, in substance at least, is amply confirmed by the passages in which Justin has been imitated by Minucius and Tertullian, as cited above on l. 8.

21. αἵτε πρόοδοι ὑμῶν. *Your state processions.* By an anacoluthon of not unusual occurrence, the nominative δεικνύντες is put for the genitive δεικνύντων.

25. διὰ γραμμάτων. Plutarch. in Gracch. c. 8, διὰ γραμμάτων ἐν στοαῖς καὶ τοίχοις καὶ μνήμασι γραφομένων. Cic. Phil. II. 63, *Vidimus in basi statuarum* maximis literis *incisum.* XIV. 12, *Incisæ aut inscriptæ* literæ, *divinæ virtutis testes sempiternæ.* It is therefore needless to read, either with Sylburg, δι' ἐπιγραμμάτων, or, with Grabe, διὰ διαγραμμάτων.

γενομένου ἐν ἀνθρώποις, καὶ ὅπως διὰ τῶν προφητῶν προεκεκήρυκτο ἔμαθον, καὶ ἐν παντὶ γένει πιστευόμενον καὶ προσδοκώμενον ἔγνωσαν, πάλιν, ὡς προεδηλώσαμεν, προεβάλλοντο ἄλλους, Σίμωνα μὲν καὶ Μένανδρον ἀπὸ Σαμαρείας, οἳ καὶ μαγικὰς δυνάμεις ποιήσαντες πολλοὺς ἐξηπάτησαν, καὶ ἔτι ἀπατωμένους ἔχουσι. Καὶ γὰρ παρ' ὑμῖν, ὡς προέφημεν, ἐν τῇ βασιλίδι Ῥώμῃ ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος γενόμενος ὁ Σίμων, καὶ τὴν ἱερὰν σύγκλητον καὶ τὸν δῆμον Ῥωμαίων εἰς τοσοῦτο κατεπλήξατο, ὡς θεὸς νομισθῆναι, καὶ ἀνδριάντι, ὡς τοὺς ἄλλους παρ' ὑμῖν τιμωμένους θεοὺς, τιμηθῆναι. Ὅθεν τήν τε ἱερὰν σύγκλητον καὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν ὑμέτερον συνεπιγνώμονας ταύτης ἡμῶν τῆς ἀξιώσεως παραλαβεῖν αἰτοῦμεν, ἵν' εἴ τις εἴη τοῖς ἀπ' ἐκείνου διδάγμασι κατεχόμενος, τἀληθὲς μαθὼν τὴν πλάνην φυγεῖν δυνηθῇ· καὶ τὸν ἀνδριάντα, εἰ βούλεσθε καθαιρήσατε.

Their attempts, however, to overthrow the Gospel, and suppress the doctrine of final retribution, will be vain: for, though they may excite evil-disposed men to persecute believers, such persecutions, without effecting their purpose, turn only to the ruin of their authors.

LVII. Οὐ γὰρ μὴ γενέσθαι τὴν ἐκπύρωσιν ἐπὶ κολάσει τῶν ἀσεβῶν, οἱ φαῦλοι δαίμονες πεῖσαι δύνανται· ὅνπερ τρόπον οὐδὲ λαθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν παραγενόμενον ἴσχυσαν πρᾶξαι, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνο μόνον, τοὺς ἀλόγως βιοῦντας, καὶ ἐμπαθῶς ἐν ἔθεσι φαύλοις τεθραμμένους, καὶ φιλοδοξοῦντας, ἀναιρεῖν ἡμᾶς καὶ μισεῖν δύνανται ποιῆσαι, οὓς οὐ μόνον οὐ μισοῦμεν, ἀλλ', ὡς δείκνυται, ἐλεοῦντες μεταθέσθαι πεῖσαι βουλόμεθα. Οὐ γὰρ δεδοίκαμεν θάνατον, τοῦ πάντως ἀποθανεῖν ὁμολογουμένου, καὶ μηδενὸς ἄλλου καινοῦ, ἀλλ' ἢ τῶν αὐτῶν ἐν τῇδε τῇ διοικήσει ὄντων· ὧν εἰ μὲν κόρος τοὺς μετασχόντας κἂν ἐνιαυτοῦ ἔχῃ, ἵνα ἀεὶ ὦσι καὶ ἀπαθεῖς καὶ ἀνενδεεῖς, τοῖς ἡμετέροις διδάγμασι προσέχειν δεῖ. Εἰ δ' ἀπιστοῦσι μηδὲν εἶναι μετὰ θάνατον, ἀλλ' εἰς ἀναισθησίαν χωρεῖν τοὺς ἀποθνήσκοντας ἀποφαίνονται, παθῶν τῶν ἐνταῦθα καὶ χρειῶν ἡμᾶς ῥυόμενοι εὐεργετοῦσιν,

LVI. 6. ὡς προεδηλώσαμεν. Namely, in c. 26. See notes *ad loc.*

12. κατεπλήξατο. Cod. Reg. in marg. κατέπληξεν.

13. ὡς τοὺς ἄλλους π. ὑ. τ. θεούς. *Scil.* τιμᾶτε.

LVII. 4. ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνο μόνον, κ. τ. λ. See above, on c. 5, 3.

8. τοῦ πάντως ἀποθανεῖν ὁμολογουμένου. See on c. 11, 9.

9. μηδενὸς ἄλλου καινοῦ κ. τ. λ. Compare Eccles. i. 9, 10.

10. ὧν εἰ μὲν κόρος. *Vulgo* εἰ μὴ, which obviously inverts the sense. Thirlby and later editors have therefore acquiesced in substituting μὲν for μή.

15. παθῶν μὲν ἐνταῦθα κ. τ. λ. Thirlby compares the remark of Socrates (ap. Plat. Apol. T. I. p. 95, ed. Bipont.), Ἀλλά μοι δῆλόν ἐστι τοῦτο, ὅτι ἤδη

ἑαυτοὺς δὲ φαύλους καὶ μισανθρώπους καὶ φιλοδόξους δεικνύουσιν. Οὐ γὰρ ὡς ἀπαλλάξοντες ἡμᾶς ἀναιροῦσιν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀποστεροῦντες ζωῆς καὶ ἡδονῆς φονεύουσι.

Of the heretics, then raised up, Marcion was still, in Justin's time, propagating his errors; but those who led holy lives would be enabled to escape their seductions.

LVIII. Καὶ Μαρκίωνα δὲ τὸν ἀπὸ Πόντου, ὡς προέφημεν, προεβάλλοντο οἱ φαῦλοι δαίμονες, ὃς ἀρνεῖσθαι μὲν τὸν ποιητὴν τῶν οὐρανίων καὶ γηΐνων ἁπάντων Θεὸν, καὶ τὸν προκηρυχθέντα διὰ τῶν προφητῶν Χριστὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ νῦν διδάσκει, ἄλλον δέ τινα καταγγέλλει παρὰ τὸν δημιουργὸν τὸν πάντων Θεὸν, καὶ ὁμοίως ἕτερον υἱόν· ᾧ πολλοὶ πεισθέντες, ὡς μόνῳ τἀληθῆ ἐπισταμένῳ, ἡμῶν καταγελῶσιν, ἀπόδειξιν μηδεμίαν περὶ ὧν λέγουσιν ἔχοντες, ἀλλὰ ἀλόγως, ὡς ὑπὸ λύκου ἄρνες συνηρπασμένοι, βορὰ τῶν ἀθέων δογμάτων καὶ δαιμόνων γίνονται. Οὐ γὰρ ἄλλο τι ἀγωνίζονται οἱ λεγόμενοι δαίμονες, ἢ ἀπάγειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀπὸ τοῦ ποιήσαντος Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ πρωτογόνου αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ· καὶ τοὺς μὲν τῆς γῆς μὴ ἐπαίρεσθαι δυναμένους τοῖς γηΐνοις καὶ χειροποιήτοις προσήλωσαν καὶ προσηλοῦσι, τοὺς δὲ ἐπὶ θεωρίαν θείων ὁρμῶντας ὑπεκκρούοντες, ἢν μὴ λογισμὸν σώφρονα καὶ καθαρὸν καὶ ἀπαθῆ βίον ἔχωσιν, εἰς ἀσέβειαν ἐμβάλλουσιν.

Plato's cosmogony was derived from that of Moses; who likewise employed the term *Erebus*, afterwards adopted by the poets.

LIX. Ἵνα δὲ καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἡμετέρων διδασκάλων—λέγομεν δὲ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν—λαβόντα τὸν Πλάτωνα μάθητε τὸ εἰπεῖν, ὕλην ἄμορφον οὖσαν στρέψαντα

τεθνάναι καὶ ἀπηλλάχθαι πραγμάτων βέλτιον ἦν μοι. Διὰ ταυτὶ τοῖς καταψηφισαμένοις μου καὶ τοῖς κατηγόροις οὐ πάνυ χαλεπαίνω, καίτοι οὐ ταύτῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ κατεψηφίζοντό μου καὶ κατηγόρουν, ἀλλ' οἰόμενοι βλάπτειν τι· τοῦτο αὐτοῖς ἄξιον μέμφεσθαι.

16. φιλοδόξους. A favourite word with Justin, and opposed, in c. 53, τοῖς τἀληθὲς ἀσπαζομένοις. See also a few lines above; and compare Apol. II. c. 3. Hence φιλοδαίμονας, which has been offered as a conjectural emendation, is altogether inadmissible.

17. ἀπαλλάξοντες. *Scil.* τῶν παθῶν καὶ χρειῶν.

LVIII. 1. ὡς προέφημεν. At c. 26, 22. See note *ad loc.*

6. τὸν πάντων Θ. Sylburg would read τῶν πάντων.

13. τῆς γῆς μὴ ἐπαίρεσθαι δ. *Those who are unable to raise themselves above the earth;* i. e. who are wholly devoted to earthly pursuits and pleasures. It is not necessary either to insert ἀπὸ before τῆς γῆς, or to read ἀπαίρεσθαι, as Sylburg proposes.

LIX. 2. τοῦ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν. *Scil.* κηρυχθέντος. Grabe and Thirlby, less conveniently, supply λαλήσαντος. The latter would also read παρὰ τοῦ ἡμετέρου διδασκάλου.

3. ὕλην ἄμορφον οὖσαν στρέψαντα κ. τ. λ. See on cc. 10, 8; 20, 11. In

τὸν Θεὸν κόσμον ποιῆσαι, ἀκούσατε τῶν αὐτολεξεὶ εἰρημένων διὰ Μωσέως, τοῦ προδεδηλωμένου πρώτου προφήτου, καὶ πρεσβυτέρου τῶν ἐν Ἕλλησι συγγραφέων, δι' οὗ μηνύον τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα πῶς τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ ἐκ τίνων ἐδημιούργησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν κόσμον, ἔφη οὕτως· Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν. Ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος, καὶ σκότος ἐπάνω τῆς ἀβύσσου· καὶ πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τῶν ὑδάτων. Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Θεὸς, Γενηθήτω φῶς· καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως. Ὥστε λόγῳ Θεοῦ, ἐκ τῶν ὑποκειμένων καὶ προδηλωθέντων διὰ Μωσέως, γεγενῆσθαι τὸν πάντα κόσμον, καὶ Πλάτων, καὶ οἱ ταὐτὰ λέγοντες, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐμάθομεν, καὶ ὑμεῖς πεισθῆναι δύνασθε. Καὶ τὸ καλούμενον Ἔρεβος παρὰ τοῖς ποιηταῖς, εἰρῆσθαι πρότερον ὑπὸ Μωσέως οἴδαμεν.

LX. Καὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ παρὰ Πλάτωνι Τιμαίῳ φυσιολογούμενον περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅτε λέγει, Ἐχίασεν αὐτὸν

From the same source also Plato obtained his notions of the second and third persons in his Trinity; so that Christians do not adopt the opinions of others, but others speak with reference to theirs.

accordance with Justin's assertion of the Mosaic origin of Plato's opinions, Clemens Alexandrinus (Strom. I.) calls him τὸν Ἑβραίων φιλόσοφον, citing at the same time the expression of the Pythagorean Numenius, τί ἐστι Πλάτων ἢ Μωϋσῆς ἀττικίζων; Compare also Euseb. Præp. Ev. XI.—XIII.; Augustin. Civ. D. VIII. 11, XVIII. 41; Doctr. Christ. II.' 28. . With respect to the charge which has been brought against Justin of corrupting Christianity with an admixture of Platonism, see the *Introductory Observations*, p. 12, and Bishop Kaye's Justin, ch. 2, pp. 46 sqq.—For στρέψαντα, Sylburg would read τρέψαντα, and Bp. Kaye seems to acquiesce in the change; but Otto agrees with Grabe in advocating the received text.

5. τοῦ προδ. πρώτου προφήτου. See above, on cc. 31, 36; 44, 21.

8. ἐν ἀρχῇ κ. τ. λ. From Gen. i. 1 sqq.

15. ταὐτά. So Thirlby, with whom the Benedictine and other editors agree. *Vulgo* ταῦτα.

16. Ἔρεβος. In the derivation of this word from the Hebrew עֶרֶב, *the evening* (Gen. i. 5), many of the learned agree. Otto, however, refers for an exposition of Justin's meaning to Deut. xxxii. 22, as quoted in the next chapter.

LX. 1. τὸ φυσιολογούμενον. *That which is physiologically treated;* or, in other words, *the physiological discussion.*

2. ἐχίασεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ παντί. *He* (God) *impressed him as a* χίασμα, i.e. in the form of the letter X, *upon the universe.* In the passage of the Timæus to which Justin alludes, Plato, speaking of the equal diffusion of the soul of the world over all parts of the creation, says (T. IX. p. 314, ed. Bipont.)—ταύτην οὖν τὴν ξύστασιν πᾶσαν διπλῆν κατὰ μῆκος σχίσας, μέσην πρὸς μέσην ἑκατέραν ἀλλήλαις, οἷον X, προσβαλὼν, κατέκαμψεν εἰς κύκλον. Cicero thus translates the passage—*Hanc igitur omnem conjunctionem duplicem in longitudinem diffidit, mediæque accommodans mediam quasi decussavit.* It is somewhat difficult to conceive how Justin can have deduced the Platonic idea of the χίασμα from the

ἐν τῷ παντὶ, παρὰ Μωσέως λαβὼν ὁμοίως εἶπεν. Ἐν γὰρ ταῖς Μωσέως γραφαῖς ἀναγέγραπται, ὡς κατ' ἐκεῖνο τοῦ καιροῦ ὅτε ἐξῆλθον ἀπὸ Αἰγύπτου οἱ Ἰσραηλῖται, καὶ γεγόνασιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, ἀπήντησαν αὐτοῖς ἰοβόλα θηρία, ἔχιδναί τε καὶ ἀσπίδες καὶ ὄφεων πᾶν γένος, ὃ ἐθανάτου τὸν λαόν· καὶ, κατ' ἐπίπνοιαν καὶ ἐνέργειαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ γενομένην, λαβεῖν τὸν Μωσέα χαλκὸν, καὶ ποιῆσαι τύπον σταυροῦ, καὶ τοῦτον στῆσαι ἐπὶ τῇ ἁγίᾳ σκηνῇ, καὶ εἰπεῖν τῷ λαῷ, Ἐὰν προσβλέπητε τῷ τύπῳ τούτῳ, καὶ πιστεύητε, ἐν αὐτῷ σωθήσεσθε. Καὶ γενομένου τούτου, τοὺς μὲν ὄφεις ἀποθανεῖν ἀνέγραψε, τὸν δὲ λαὸν ἐκφυγεῖν τὸν θάνατον οὕτως παρέδωκεν. Ἃ ἀναγνοὺς Πλάτων, καὶ μὴ ἀκριβῶς ἐπιστάμενος μηδὲ νοήσας τύπον εἶναι σταυροῦ, ἀλλὰ χίασμα νοήσας, τὴν μετὰ τὸν πρῶτον Θεὸν δύναμιν κεχιάσθαι ἐν τῷ παντὶ εἶπε. Καὶ τὸ εἰπεῖν αὐτὸν τρίτον, ἐπειδὴ, ὡς προείπομεν, ἐπάνω τῶν ὑδάτων ἀνέγνω ὑπὸ Μωσέως εἰρημένον ἐπιφέρεσθαι τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ πνεῦμα. Δευτέραν μὲν γὰρ χώραν τῷ παρὰ Θεοῦ λόγῳ, ὃν κεχιάσθαι ἐν τῷ παντὶ ἔφη, δίδωσι· τὴν δὲ τρίτην τῷ λεχθέντι

Mosaic account of the elevation of the brazen serpent in the wilderness; for, though it is clear from John iii. 14, that the pole, on which the serpent was suspended, was a *τύπος σταυροῦ*, or, as Tertullian (de Idol. c. 5) observes, *figuram designasse dominicæ crucis*, there is nothing in the narrative in Numb. xxi. 6 sqq., to lead Plato to such a conclusion. Neither is it recorded in Scripture, that Moses placed the figure upon the holy tabernacle; but Justin, assuming this point, and, like many of the Fathers, regarding the tabernacle as an emblem of the universe, would readily allow his imagination to connect the Platonic sign of the letter X with the typical figure erected in the wilderness. This idea of the tabernacle was entertained by Philo (V. Mos. III. 3) and Josephus (Ant. III. 7, 7). Compare Justin's Cohort. ad Græc. c. 29. Of the typical character of the brazen serpent, see also Dial. Tryph. cc. 94, 112; S. Barnab. Epist. Cathol. c. 12; Tertul. adv. Jud. c. 10.

9. *γενομένην*. *Vulgo* *λεγομένην*. A similar confusion has been rectified in c. 54.

14. *ἃ ἀναγνοὺς Π.* In the MSS. and earlier edd. the punctuation is at *θάνατον*, and the new period commences with *Οὕτως παρέδωκεν ἀναγνοὺς Πλ. κ. τ. λ.* For *οὕτως* Davies suggested *τοῦτο*; but with the new pointing introduced by Grabe, and the insertion of the relative *ἃ* which had been hastily omitted by the copyists, Thirlby has completed the restoration of the passage.

17. *καὶ τὸ εἰπεῖν αὐτὸν τρίτον.* Supply *μάθετε*, from the commencement of the last chapter.

18. *ὡς προείπομεν.* The reference is to Gen. i. 2, quoted in c. 59.

ἐπιφέρεσθαι τῷ ὕδατι πνεύματι, εἰπών, Τὰ δὲ τρίτα περὶ τὸν τρίτον. Καὶ ὡς ἐκπύρωσιν γενήσεσθαι διὰ Μωσέως προεμήνυσε τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα, ἀκούσατε. Ἔφη δὲ οὕτως· Καταβήσεται ἀείζωον πῦρ, καὶ καταφάγεται μέχρι τῆς ἀβύσσου κάτω. Οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ οὖν ἡμεῖς ἄλλοις δοξάζομεν, ἀλλ' οἱ πάντες τὰ ἡμέτερα μιμούμενοι λέγουσι. Παρ' ἡμῖν οὖν ἐστὶ ταῦτα ἀκοῦσαι καὶ μαθεῖν παρὰ τῶν οὐδὲ τοὺς χαρακτῆρας τῶν στοιχείων ἐπισταμένων, ἰδιωτῶν μὲν καὶ βαρβάρων τὸ φθέγμα, σοφῶν δὲ καὶ πιστῶν τὸν νοῦν ὄντων, καὶ πηρῶν καὶ χήρων τινῶν τὰς ὄψεις. Ὡς συνεῖναι οὐ σοφίᾳ ἀνθρωπείᾳ ταῦτα γεγονέναι, ἀλλὰ δυνάμει Θεοῦ λέγεσθαι.

The concluding chapters of the Apology are devoted to an exposition of the nature and object of the Christian Sacraments: and first of *Baptism*; the manner of performing the rite, the reason and necessity of its observance, and the benefits which it communicates.

LXI. Ὃν τρόπον δὲ καὶ ἀνεθήκαμεν ἑαυτοὺς τῷ Θεῷ καινοποιηθέντες διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐξηγησόμεθα, ὅπως μή, τοῦτο παραλιπόντες, δόξωμεν πονηρεύειν τι ἐν τῇ ἐξηγήσει. Ὅσοι ἂν πεισθῶσι καὶ πιστεύωσιν ἀληθῆ ταῦτα τὰ ὑφ' ἡμῶν

22. τὰ δὲ τρίτα περὶ τὸν τρίτον. Plat. Epist. 2, ad Dionysium (T. xi. p. 69, ed. Bipont.): περὶ τὸν πάντων βασιλέα πάντ' ἐστί, καὶ ἐκείνου ἕνεκα πάντα, καὶ ἐκεῖνο αἴτιον ἁπάντων τῶν καλῶν· δεύτερον δὲ πέρι, τὰ δεύτερα· καὶ τρίτον πέρι, τὰ τρίτα. By the punctuation of this difficult passage which is here adopted, the sense accords with the form in which it is given by Justin. Compare Procli Theol. Platon. ii. 11. However interpreted, it affords undoubted evidence of Justin's belief in the distinct personality of the Holy Spirit. See on c. 6, 5. At the same time it is utterly impossible, as Bishop Kaye remarks, that Justin should have originally deduced his notions respecting the Trinity from sources such as these. It should also be noted, that the Epistle to Dionysius is unquestionably spurious. See Ast, on the *Life and Writings of Plato.*

25. καταβήσεται ἀείζωον πῦρ κ. τ. λ. From Deut. xxxii. 22.

27. τὰ ἡμέτερα μιμούμενοι. Tertull. Apol. c. 46, *Mimicè philosophi adfectant veritatem, et adfectando corrumpunt.* See on cc. 5, 18; 20, 6; 44, 21.

28. παρ' ἡμῖν οὖν ἐστὶ κ. τ. λ. Hence Iren. Hær. iii. 4, *Hanc fidem qui sine literis crediderunt, quantum ad sermonem nostrum barbari sunt, quantum autem ad sententiam et consuetudinem et conversationem propter fidem perquam sapientissimi sunt, et placent Deo, conversantes in omni justitia et castitate et sapientia.* Tertul. Apol. c. 46, *Deum quilibet opifex Christianus et invenit et ostendit, et exinde totum, quod a Deo quæritur, se quoque assignat; licet Plato affirmet factitatorem universitatis neque inveniri facilem, et inventum enarrari in omnes difficilem.* Compare Athenag. Legat. c. 11.

31. ὡς συνεῖναι κ. τ. λ. Lactant. Institt. Div. ii. 3, *Verum scire, divinæ est sapientiæ: homo autem per se ipsum pervenire ad hanc scientiam non potest, nisi doceatur a Deo.* Compare 1 Cor. ii. 4, 5.—For συνεῖναι, it is unnecessary to read συνιέναι, with Braunius and others. See on c. 14, 3.

LXI. 1. ἀνεθήκαμεν ἑαυτοὺς κ. τ. λ. See above on c. 49.

4. ὑφ' ἡμῶν διδασκόμενα. So in c. 66, τὰ δεδιδαγμένα ὑφ' ἡμῶν. In the

διδασκόμενα καὶ λεγόμενα εἶναι, καὶ βιοῦν οὕτως δύνασθαι ὑπισχνῶνται, εὔχεσθαί τε καὶ αἰτεῖν νηστεύοντες παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν προημαρτημένων ἄφεσιν διδάσκονται, ἡμῶν συνευχομένων καὶ συννηστευόντων αὐτοῖς. Ἔπειτα ἄγονται ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἔνθα ὕδωρ ἐστὶ, καὶ τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως, ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἀνεγεννήθημεν, ἀναγεννῶνται. Ἐπ' ὀνόματος γὰρ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ δεσπότου Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ

early editions the preposition is ἐφ', which is manifestly incorrect.—In order to prepare the candidate for baptism, he went through a course of catechetical instruction, varying in some degree according to the age and condition of the catechumen. The nature of this preparation will be seen in the forms prescribed by the Apostolical Constitutions; and a complete summary of Christian faith and practice, as taught by the early Church, will be found in the *Catechetical Discourses* of Cyril of Jerusalem. Of Justin's views on the subject of Baptism, see Bp. Kaye's work, chap. 4, pp. 84, 90.

6. *νηστεύοντες.* Grabe compares Constt. Apost. VII. 22, *πρὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος νηστευσάτω ὁ βαπτιζόμενος.* It will be observed that Justin speaks of remission of sins in baptism as extending only to those previously committed (*τῶν προημαρτημένων ἄφεσιν*). So again in what follows, *ὅπως ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτιων ὑπὲρ ὧν προημάρτομεν τύχωμεν.* Compare Dial. Tryph. c. 86; Clem. Alex. Strom. II. 13, 58; IV. 24, 156; Origen. Hom. in Jud. VII. 2; Select. in Jerem. III. 7; Tertull. de Baptism. cc. 8, 15; Cyprian. de Dei Grat. c. 4; De Op. et Eleemos. c. 1.

9. *ἔνθα ὕδωρ ἐστί.* With respect to the place of baptism, the disciples of John the Baptist and of Jesus were baptised by *immersion* in the river Jordan or any other stream of water (Matt. iii. 6; Acts viii. 36; xvi. 13, 15); and possibly by *aspersion* in houses (Acts ix. 18; x. 47; xvi. 33). It seems from this place, that in the early days of the Church a similar practice prevailed: and thus the Clementine Homilies (IX. 19) speak of "a river, a fountain, or the sea," as suitable for performing the rite according to circumstances; and Tertullian (de Bapt. c. 4) considers it immaterial whether a person was baptised "in the sea, or in standing or running water, or in fountain, lake, or river." Baptisteries were very general in the fifth and sixth centuries; but the periods at which they were attached to churches, and superseded by fonts, is not precisely known. See Ambros. de Sacram. III. 2, 3; August. Civ. D. XXII. 8.

9. *τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως, κ. τ. λ.* The antient Fathers agree with Justin in identifying regeneration, and the *laver of regeneration* (*λουτρὸν ἀναγεννήσεως*), with baptism. See Iren. Hær. II. 22, 4; Clem. Alex. Pædag. I. 6; Tertul. de Bapt. cc. 5, 7, 16. Compare Tit. iii. 5.

10. *ἐπ' ὀνόματος γὰρ τοῦ πατρὸς κ. τ. λ.* Justin here manifestly alludes to the baptismal formula prescribed by Christ himself (Matt. xxviii. 19); and there was never any variation from it in the early Church. The Apostolical Constitutions (III. 16) and Canons (c. 49) enjoin its use under heavy penalties; and Tertullian (de Bapt. c. 13) speaks of it as *lex tingendi imposita et forma præscripta.* Compare Iren. Hær. III. 19; Tertul. adv. Prax. c. 26; Cyprian. Epist. 73; Augustin. de Bapt. VI. 25; Ambros. de Sacrament. *in fine.* See also Bingham's *Christian Antiquities,* B. II. c. 3.

σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου, τὸ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι τότε λουτρὸν ποιοῦνται. Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν· Ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. Ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἀδύνατον εἰς τὰς μήτρας τῶν τεκουσῶν τοὺς ἅπαξ γεννωμένους ἐμβῆναι, φανερὸν πᾶσίν ἐστι. Καὶ διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου, ὡς προεγράψαμεν, εἴρηται τίνα τρόπον φεύξονται τὰς ἁμαρτίας οἱ ἁμαρτήσαντες καὶ μετανοοῦντες. Ἐλέχθη δὲ οὕτως· Λούσασθε, καθαροὶ γένεσθε, ἀφέλετε τὰς πονηρίας ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν, μάθετε καλὸν ποιεῖν, κρίνατε ὀρφανῷ καὶ δικαιώσατε χήραν· καὶ δεῦτε, καὶ διαλεχθῶμεν, λέγει κύριος. Καὶ ἐὰν ὦσιν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ὑμῶν ὡς φοινικοῦν, ὡσεὶ ἔριον λευκανῶ· καὶ ἐὰν ὦσιν ὡς κόκκινον, ὡς χιόνα λευκανῶ. Ἐὰν δὲ μὴ εἰσακούσητέ μου, μάχαιρα ὑμᾶς κατέδεται· τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου ἐλάλησε ταῦτα. Καὶ λόγον δὲ εἰς τοῦτο παρὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐμάθομεν τοῦτον. Ἐπειδὴ τὴν πρώτην γένεσιν ἡμῶν ἀγνοοῦντες, κατ' ἀνάγκην γεγεννήμεθα ἐξ ὑγρᾶς σπορᾶς κατὰ μίξιν τὴν τῶν γονέων πρὸς ἀλλήλους, καὶ ἐν ἔθεσι φαύλοις καὶ πονηραῖς ἀνατροφαῖς γεγόναμεν, ὅπως μὴ ἀνάγκης τέκνα μηδὲ ἀγνοίας μένωμεν, ἀλλὰ προαιρέσεως καὶ ἐπιστήμης, ἀφέσεώς τε ἁμαρτιῶν ὑπὲρ ὧν προημάρτομεν τύχωμεν ἐν τῷ ὕδατι, ἐπονομάζεται τῷ ἑλομένῳ ἀναγεννηθῆναι, καὶ μετανοήσαντι ἐπὶ τοῖς ἡμαρτημένοις, τὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ δεσπότου Θεοῦ ὄνομα· αὐτὸ τοῦτο

14. *ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε κ. τ. λ.* From John iii. 3 sqq. For *γεννωμένους*, of which there is no reason to doubt the genuineness, the Cod. Clar. has *γενομένους*, with *γεννηθέντας* in the margin.

17. *ὡς προεγράψαμεν.* The reference is to c. 44, where the same passage from Isaiah (i. 16 sqq.) is cited, but for a different purpose.

27. *ἐπειδὴ τὴν πρώτην γένεσιν κ. τ. λ.* There is no allusion in this passage, as some have thought, to the doctrine of *original sin*, but merely to the corrupting influence of education and example. It will be observed also, that the second birth spoken of depends upon the *will* of each individual, and consequently implies that the baptised person is an adult. See, however, on c. 15, 17, and Bp. Kaye's Justin, p. 76. With respect to original sin, there is another passage (Dial. Tryph. c. 100,) in which an allusion to it has been imagined, but without any apparent grounds. For *γεγεννήμεθα* the Benedictine edition has *γεγενήμεθα*, which is not the reading of either MS.

35. *αὐτὸ τ. μ. ἐπιλέγοντος τοῦ τὸν λ. ἄγοντος ἐ. τ. λ.* This is the easy and elegant emendation of Thirlby, which Otto had previously admitted into the text. The vulgar reading is *ἐπιλέγοντες, τοῦτον λ. ἄγοντες ἐ. τ. λ.* Sylburg proposes *καὶ αὐτὸ* and *ἄγομεν*, omitting *τοῦ*, and Grabe suggests *τούτῳ, scil.*

μόνον ἐπιλέγοντος τοῦ τὸν λουσόμενον ἄγοντος ἐπὶ τὸ λουτρόν. Ὄνομα γὰρ τῷ ἀῤῥήτῳ Θεῷ οὐδεὶς ἔχει εἰπεῖν· εἰ δέ τις τολμήσειεν εἶναι λέγειν, μέμηνε τὴν ἄσωτον μανίαν. Καλεῖται δὲ τοῦτο τὸ λουτρὸν φωτισμὸς, ὡς φωτιζομένων τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν ταῦτα μανθανόντων. Καὶ ἐπ' ὀνόματος δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σταυρωθέντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ ἐπ' ὀνόματος πνεύματος ἁγίου, ὃ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν προεκήρυξε τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν πάντα, ὁ φωτιζόμενος λούεται.

Deo. Having mentioned the *name of God*, Justin, before he concludes the baptismal formula, starts off, in his usual digressive manner, into an explanation of the sense in which the expression is to be understood; and then again into another of the import of τὸ λουτρὸν, mentioned in the first digression.—Of the *namelessness* of God, see above on c. 10, 6.

39. φωτισμός. This term is very generally applied to baptism by the early Christian writers, and Justin here explains it with reference to the *illumination* of the minds of the *catechumens* by the instruction which they received in the principles of the Christian religion before the rite was administered to them. Clemens Alexandrinus, however, in enumerating the several names by which the sacrament was designated, refers it to a certain inward illumination communicated by the ordinance itself. Thus Pædagog. I. 6, 26, Καλεῖται πολλαχῶς τὸ ἔργον τοῦτο· χάρισμα, καὶ φώτισμα, καὶ τέλειον, καὶ λουτρόν. Λουτρὸν μὲν, δι' οὗ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἀποῤῥυπτόμεθα· χάρισμα δὲ, ᾧ τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἁμαρτήμασιν ἐπιτίμια ἀνεῖται· φώτισμα δὲ, δι' οὗ τὸ ἅγιον ἐκεῖνο φῶς σωτήριον ἐποπτεύεται, τουτέστι, δι' οὗ τὸ θεῖον ὀξυωποῦμεν· τέλειον δὲ, τὸ ἀπροσδεὲς φαμέν. He had previously said, βαπτιζόμενοι φωτιζόμεθα· φωτιζόμενοι υἱοποιούμεθα· υἱοποιούμενοι τελειούμεθα· τελειούμενοι ἀπαθανατιζόμεθα. Elsewhere, however, Clement seems to apply the term to the instruction preparatory to baptism; as in Strom. v. 684, 26, διὰ τοῦτι φωτισμὸς ἡ μαθητεία κέκληται. The term has been thought to have originated in the use of the verb φωτίζεσθαι by St. Paul, in Eph. i. 18, iii. 9; Heb. vi. 4, x. 32. Hence Chrysostom in his Catechism πρὸς τοὺς μέλλοντας φωτίζεσθαι, c. 1: καλεῖται καὶ φώτισμα· καὶ τοῦτο αὐτὸ Παῦλος αὐτὸς ἐκάλεσε. From the word thus applied the baptistery was sometimes called φωτιστήριον. It has been observed, that the Fathers generally called those already baptised φωτιζόμενοι, and the catechumens φωτισθέντες. If so, Justin is clearly an exception to the rule, for the catechumens are here called φωτιζόμενοι, and in c. 65, φωτισθεὶς is applied to a baptised person. Perhaps the terms were used indifferently, with reference to the *illumination* essential to baptism, rather than to the rite itself. For φωτιζομένων, it has been proposed to read φώτιζον μὲν, and in the end of the clause Thirlby maintains that beyond all doubt the true reading must be τῶν αὐτοῦ μετασχόντων. No change whatever is required, if indeed it be admissible; even the substitution of μαθόντων for μανθανόντων being a mere unnecessary conjecture. The words τῶν ταῦτα μανθανόντων bear, as Otto observes, a manifest reference to τὰ ὑφ' ἡμῶν διδασκόμενα, in the beginning of the chapter.

LXII. Καὶ τὸ λουτρὸν δὴ τοῦτο ἀκούσαντες οἱ δαίμονες διὰ τοῦ προφήτου κεκηρυγμένον, ἐνήργησαν καὶ ῥαντίζειν ἑαυτοὺς τοὺς εἰς τὰ ἱερὰ αὐτῶν ἐπιβαίνοντας καὶ προσιέναι αὐτοῖς μέλλοντας, λοιβὰς καὶ κνίσας ἀποτελοῦντας· τέλεον δὲ καὶ λούεσθαι ἀπιόντας πρὶν ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὰ ἱερά, ἔνθα ἵδρυνται, ἐνεργοῦσι. Καὶ γὰρ τὸ ὑπολύεσθαι ἐπιβαίνοντας τοῖς ἱεροῖς, καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς τοὺς θρησκεύοντας, κελεύεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἱερατευόντων, ἐκ τῶν συμβάντων Μωσεῖ τῷ εἰρημένῳ προφήτῃ μαθόντες οἱ δαίμονες ἐμιμήσαντο. Κατ' ἐκεῖνο γὰρ τοῦ καιροῦ, ὅτε Μωσῆς ἐκελεύσθη κατελθὼν εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐξαγαγεῖν τὸν ἐκεῖ λαὸν τῶν Ἰσραηλιτῶν, ποιμαίνοντος αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ Ἀραβικῇ γῇ πρόβατα

In a digression of some length, Justin observes that the dæmons, in furtherance of their seductive plans, suggested the introduction of washings and sprinklings into the heathen worship, in imitation of Christian baptism; as they had also, from Christ's injunction to Moses from the burning bush, required that those who entered their temples should put off their shoes.

LXII. 2. *διὰ τοῦ προφήτου.* The reference is doubtless to the passage of Isaiah quoted in the last chapter. Justin, however, has been supposed to allude to Ezek. xxxvi. 25.

2. *ἐνήργησαν καὶ ῥαντίζειν ἑαυτοὺς κ. τ. λ.* Tertull. de Præscr. c. 40, *Ipsas quoque res sacramentorum divinorum in idolorum mysteriis imitatur* Diabolus. *Tingit et ipse quosdam, utique credentes et fideles nos; expiationem delictorum de lavacro repromittit.* De Bapt. c. 5, *Nationes, extraneæ ab omni intellectu spiritualium, potestatem eadem efficacia idolis suis subministrant, sed viduis aquis sibi mentiuntur. Nam et sacris quibusdam per lavacrum initiantur Isidis alicujus, aut Mithræ.* Augustin. de Bapt. c. Donatist. vi. 25, *In multis idolorum sacrilegis sacris baptizati homines perhibentur.* Compare Chrysost. Hom. in Matt. ii. To the ablutions of the heathens as a religious ceremony there are frequent allusions in their poets. Thus Hesiod. Op. D. 724, *Μηδέ ποτ' ἐξ ἠοῦς Διῒ λείβειν αἴθοπα οἶνον Χερσὶν ἀνίπτοισι, μηδ' ἄλλοις ἀθανάτοισιν· Οὐ γὰρ τοίγε κλύουσιν, ἀποπτύουσι δέ τ' ἀράς.* See also my notes on Hom. Il. A. 499, Z. 266.

5. *τέλεον δὲ καὶ λούεσθαι κ. τ. λ.* *Multa hic sed inutili labore Thirlbius excogitat; videlicet opinatur legendum ἐν τέλεσι pro τέλεον, aut ἅπαντας sive ἱερατεύοντας pro ἀπιόντας, aut ἐνήργ. καὶ ῥαντ. ἑ. τοὺς προσιέναι αὐτοῖς μ. λοιβ. καὶ κν. ἀποτ. τέλεον δὲ καὶ λούεσθαι ἅπαντας τοὺς εἰς τὰ ἱερὰ αὐτῶν ἐπιβ. πρὶν ἐλθεῖν κ. τ. λ.* Otto. Grabe refers to the note of Grotius on Matt. xxviii. 19. The words may be rendered, *They cause them also to wash themselves entirely, as they depart* from the sacrifice, *before they enter into* those parts of *the temples in which their images are placed.*

6. *τὸ ὑπολύεσθαι.* *Scil. τὰ ὑποδήματα αὐτῶν.* To the custom of the heathen of walking *barefoot* on certain occasions of religious ceremony, Tertullian alludes in Apol. c. 40, and adv. Psych. c. 16. Without adducing other instances, it may be observed that the disciple of Pythagoras was enjoined *θύειν ἀνυπόδετον, καὶ πρὸς ἱερὰ προσιέναι.* See Iamblich. v. Pyth. cc. 89, 105.

7. *αὐτοῖς.* Sylburg would read *ναοῖς*, Thirlby *ἀδύτοις*, and Braunius, with whom Otto coincides, *τοιούτοις.* No change seems to be necessary; and Grabe is correct in understanding *τοῖς αὐτοῖς* of *the dæmons* themselves. Compare cc. 5, 9.

τοῦ πρὸς μητρὸς θείου, ἐν ἰδέᾳ πυρὸς ἐκ βάτου προσωμίλησεν αὐτῷ ὁ ἡμέτερος Χριστὸς, καὶ εἶπεν, Ὑπόλυσαι τὰ ὑποδήματά σου, καὶ προσελθὼν ἄκουσον. Ὁ δὲ, ὑπολυσάμενος καὶ προσελθὼν, ἀκήκοε κατελθεῖν εἰς Αἴγυπτον, καὶ ἐξαγαγεῖν τὸν ἐκεῖ λαὸν τῶν Ἰσραηλιτῶν, καὶ δύναμιν ἰσχυρὰν ἔλαβε παρὰ τοῦ λαλήσαντος αὐτῷ ἐν ἰδέᾳ πυρὸς Χριστοῦ, καὶ κατελθὼν ἐξήγαγε τὸν λαὸν, ποιήσας μεγάλα καὶ θαυμάσια· ἃ εἰ βούλεσθε μαθεῖν, ἐκ τῶν συγγραμμάτων ἐκείνου ἀκριβῶς μαθήσεσθε.

Taking occasion to animadvert upon the blindness of the Jews, who conceived that it was God the Father, not the Son, who manifested himself to Moses and the Prophets; he thence infers that they knew not either the Father or the Son.

LXIII. Ἰουδαῖοι δὲ πάντες καὶ νῦν διδάσκουσι τὸν ἀνωνόμαστον Θεὸν λελαληκέναι τῷ Μωσεῖ· ὅθεν τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προμεμηνυμένου προφήτου ἐλέγχον αὐτοὺς, ὡς προεγράψαμεν, εἶπεν, Ἔγνω βοῦς τὸν κτησάμενον, καὶ ὄνος τὴν φάτνην τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ· Ἰσραὴλ

13. *τοῦ πρὸς μητρὸς θείου.* Here is another of Justin's historical inaccuracies. Jethro was not the *maternal uncle*, but the father-in-law of Moses (Exod. ii. 21, iii. 1); and it is not improbable that, as Thirlby conjectures, the mistake arose from a confusion in the writer's mind between Moses and Jacob. To the latter, while feeding the flock of Laban, his father-in-law, a divine appearance was vouchsafed; and this father-in-law was also his mother's brother. See Gen. xxix. 10, xxx. 29.

13. *προσωμίλησεν αὐτῷ ὁ ἡμέτερος Χρ.* This opinion is more fully developed in Dial. Tryph. cc. 60, 127. And not only Justin, but most of the Ante-Nicene and many later Fathers, maintained that the divine Personage who appeared to the Patriarchs and Prophets of the Old Testament, was not the Father, but the Son, the Incarnate Word of the New Testament, who suffered death for the redemption of mankind. Thus Iren. Hær. IV. 23, *Inseminatus est ubique in Scripturis Filius Dei, aliquando quidem cum Abraham loquens, aliquando cum Noë, dans eis mensuras; aliquando autem quærens Adam, aliquando autem Sodomitis inducens judicium, et rursus cum videretur et in viam dirigit Jacob, et de rubo loquitur cum Mose.* Tertull. c. Marcion. II. 27, *Profitemur Christum semper egisse in Dei Patris nomine, ipsum ab initio conversatum, ipsum congressum cum patriarchis et prophetis. Ille est qui descendit, ille qui interrogat, ille qui postulat, ille qui jurat.* See also Theophil. ad Autol. II. 22; Iren. Hær. III. 6, IV. 11, 17, 37; Tertull. adv. Prax. cc. 14 sqq.; adv. Jud. c. 9; de Præscr. Hær. c. 13; adv. Mar. c. III. 6, V. 9; de Carn. Christ. c. 6; Origen. c. Cels. VI.; Euseb. Hist. Eccl. I. 2; Dem. Ev. I. 5, V. 9; Novatian. de Trin. cc. 25 sqq.; Cyril. Hier. Cat. c. 10; Chrysost. in Gen. Hom. 41, 42, 58; Theodor. in Gen. Qu. 92, in Exod. Qu. 5; Prudent. Apoth. v. 28 sqq. The same opinion is still very generally held among divines. See Bp. Bull's Def. Fid. Nic. I. 1, 3.

14. *ὑπόλυσαι τὰ ὑποδήματα κ. τ. λ.* From Exod. iii. 5.

LXIII. 1. *ἀνωνόμαστον Θεόν.* See above, on c. 10, 6.

4. *ἐλέγχον αὐτούς.* The Benedictine editor has incorrectly printed *ἐλέγχων.* With respect to the reference, *ὡς προεγράψαμεν*, the prophecy cited from Isaiah (i. 3) had been previously adduced in c. 37.

δέ με οὐκ ἔγνω, καὶ ὁ λαός με οὐ συνῆκε. Καὶ Ἰησοῦς δὲ ὁ Χριστὸς, ὅτι οὐκ ἔγνωσαν Ἰουδαῖοι τί πατὴρ καὶ τί υἱὸς, ὁμοίως ἐλέγχων αὐτοὺς καὶ αὐτὸς εἶπεν, Οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα, εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός· οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ, καὶ οἷς ἂν ἀποκαλύψῃ ὁ υἱός. Ὁ λόγος δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ, ὡς προέφημεν. Καὶ ἄγγελος δὲ καλεῖται, καὶ ἀπόστολος· αὐτὸς γὰρ ἀπαγγέλλει ὅσα δεῖ γνωσθῆναι, καὶ ἀποστέλλεται μηνύσων ὅσα ἀγγέλλεται, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν εἶπεν· Ὁ ἐμοῦ ἀκούων, ἀκούει τοῦ ἀποστείλαντός με. Καὶ ἐκ τῶν τοῦ Μωσέως δὲ συγγραμμάτων φανερὸν τοῦτο γενήσεται. Λέλεκται δὲ ἐν αὐτοῖς οὕτως· Καὶ ἐλάλησε Μωσεῖ ἄγγελος Θεοῦ ἐν φλογὶ πυρὸς ἐκ τῆς βάτου, καὶ εἶπεν, Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν, Θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ, Θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ, Θεὸς Ἰακὼβ, ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων σου· κάτελθε εἰς Αἴγυπτον, καὶ ἐξάγαγε τὸν λαόν μου. Τὰ δ' ἑπόμενα ἐξ ἐκείνων βουλόμενοι μαθεῖν δύνασθε· οὐ γὰρ δυνατὸν ἐν τούτοις ἀναγράψαι πάντα. Ἀλλ' εἰς ἀπόδειξιν γεγόνασιν οἵδε οἱ λόγοι, ὅτι υἱὸς Θεοῦ καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός ἐστι, πρότερον λόγος ὢν, καὶ ἐν ἰδέᾳ πυρὸς ποτὲ φανεὶς, ποτὲ δὲ καὶ ἐν εἰκόνι ἀσωμάτων· νῦν δὲ διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου γένους ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος,

8. *οὐδεὶς ἔγνω κ. τ. λ.* Compare Matt. xi. 27. It is curious to observe that in this quotation, as twice given in this chapter, the words *πατὴρ* and *υἱὸς* are inverted; and so as in some degree to pervert the sense.

11. *ὡς προέφημεν.* In c. 32, 35.

11. *ἄγγελος δὲ καλεῖται, κ. τ. λ.* So in Dial. Tryph. c. 56, *ἐστὶ καὶ Θεὸς, ὃς καὶ ἄγγελος καλεῖται, διὰ τὸ ἀγγέλλειν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὅσαπερ βούλεται αὐτοῖς ἀγγεῖλαι ὁ τῶν ὅλων ποιητής.* And again: *εἷς τῶν τριῶν ἐκείνων καὶ ὁ Θεός ἐστι καὶ ἄγγελος καλεῖται, ἐκ τοῦ ἀγγέλλειν, ὡς προέφην, οὗσπερ βούλεται, τὰ παρ' αὐτοῦ ὁ τῶν ὅλων ποιητὴς Θεός.* See above, on c. 62, 13; and compare Gen. xxxi. 11, 13, xxxii. 24, 28; Exod. iii. 2, 6, 16; Malach. iii. 1. —For *ἀπαγγέλλει*, both MSS. have *παραγέλλει* in the margin, and R. Stephens deems it the true reading; but the verb *ἀπαγγέλλειν*, which signifies *nuntiare quæ ab alio acceperis*, is equally suited to the context. Of the title *ἀπόστολος*, as applied to Christ, see on c. 12, 32. Since it is only so used in the text there cited, it follows that the Epistle to the Hebrews was known and received by Justin.

14. *ὁ ἐμοῦ ἀκούων κ. τ. λ.* Compare Matt. x. 40.

17. *καὶ ἐλάλησε Μωσεῖ κ. τ. λ.* From Exod. iii. 2, 6, 10, 14, 15. See Bishop Kaye's Justin, ch. 2, pp. 60 sqq.

25. *ἐν εἰκόνι ἀσωμάτων.* Towards the end of the chapter the expression is varied into *εἰκόνος ἀσωμάτου*; whence the Benedictine editor would here also read *εἰκόνι ἀσωμάτῳ.* Though a possible, this is by no means, as Braunius

ὑπέμεινε καὶ παθεῖν ὅσα αὐτὸν ἐνήργησαν οἱ δαίμονες διατεθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνοήτων Ἰουδαίων· οἵτινες ἔχοντες ῥητῶς εἰρημένον ἐν τοῖς Μωσέως συντάγμασι, Καὶ ἐλάλησεν ἄγγελος τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ Μωσεῖ ἐν πυρὶ φλογὸς ἐν βάτῳ, καὶ εἶπεν· Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὤν, ὁ Θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰακὼβ, τὸν τῶν ὅλων πατέρα καὶ δημιουργὸν τὸν ταῦτα εἰπόντα λέγουσιν εἶναι. Ὅθεν καὶ τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα, ἐλέγχον αὐτοὺς, εἶπεν, Ἰσραὴλ δέ με οὐκ ἔγνω, καὶ ὁ λαός με οὐ συνῆκε. Καὶ πάλιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ὡς ἐδηλώσαμεν, παρ' αὐτοῖς ὢν εἶπεν, Οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα, εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός· οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ, καὶ οἷς ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ. Ἰουδαῖοι οὖν ἡγησάμενοι ἀεὶ τὸν πατέρα τῶν ὅλων λελαληκέναι τῷ Μωσεῖ, τοῦ λαλήσαντος αὐτῷ ὄντος υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὃς καὶ ἄγγελος καὶ ἀπόστολος κέκληται, δικαίως ἐλέγχονται καὶ διὰ τοῦ προφητικοῦ πνεύματος καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς οὔτε τὸν πατέρα οὔτε τὸν υἱὸν ἔγνωσαν. Οἱ γὰρ τὸν υἱὸν πατέρα φάσκοντες εἶναι, ἐλέγχονται μήτε τὸν πατέρα ἐπιστάμενοι, μήθ' ὅτι ἐστὶν υἱὸς τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων γινώσκοντες· ὃς καὶ λόγος πρωτότοκος ὢν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ Θεὸς ὑπάρχει. Καὶ πρότερον διὰ τῆς τοῦ πυρὸς μορφῆς καὶ εἰκόνος ἀσωμάτου τῷ Μωσεῖ καὶ τοῖς ἑτέροις προφήταις ἐφάνη· νῦν δ' ἐν χρόνοις τῆς ἡμετέρας ἀρχῆς, ὡς προείπομεν, διὰ παρθένου ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς βουλὴν, ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας τῶν πιστευόντων αὐτῷ καὶ ἐξουθενηθῆναι καὶ παθεῖν ὑπέμεινεν, ἵνα ἀποθανὼν καὶ ἀναστὰς νικήσῃ τὸν θάνατον. Τὸ δὲ εἰρημένον ἐκ βάτου τῷ Μωσεῖ, Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὤν, ὁ Θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰακὼβ, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων σου, σημαντικὸν τοῦ καὶ ἀποθανόντας ἐκείνους

observes, a necessary emendation. Indeed it is more than probable that Justin may have purposely diversified his former designation. It is clear that the *angels* are intended; and that *ἐνσωμάτων*, which has been offered as a conjectural reading, is altogether out of place.

45. *ὃς καὶ λόγος πρωτότοκος κ. τ. λ.* *Fortasse* *λόγος καὶ πρωτότοκος*. *Sic supra*, c. 23, Ἰ. Χ. *λόγος αὐτοῦ ὑπάρχων καὶ πρωτότοκος*. *Et in Dial.* c. 125, *Θεοῦ δὲ, ἐκ τοῦ εἶναι τέκνον πρωτότοκον τῶν ὅλων κτισμάτων*. THIRLBY. So Otto; who observes, however, that as the vulgar reading may be genuine, he ventures not to disturb it. Grabe directs attention to the testimony here offered to the *divinity of Christ;* and refers to an anonymous author in Eusebius (H. E. v. 28), who cites this passage among others, *ἐν οἷς θεολογεῖται ὁ Χριστός*.

μένειν, καὶ εἶναι αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀνθρώπους. Καὶ γὰρ πρῶτοι τῶν πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἐκεῖνοι περὶ Θεοῦ ζήτησιν ἠσχολήθησαν, Ἀβραὰμ μὲν πατὴρ ὢν τοῦ Ἰσαὰκ, Ἰσαὰκ δὲ τοῦ Ἰακὼβ, ὡς καὶ Μωσῆς ἀνέγραψε.

By a misrepresentation of the Mosaic history, Proserpine and Minerva were exalted into daughters of Jupiter: the one had a statue by the brink of fountains, and the other was regarded as the *First Intelligence* of the Creator.

LXIV. Καὶ τὸ ἀνεγείρειν δὲ τὸ εἴδωλον τῆς λεγομένης Κόρης ἐπὶ ταῖς τῶν ὑδάτων πηγαῖς ἐνεργῆσαι τοὺς δαίμονας, λέγοντας θυγατέρα αὐτὴν εἶναι τοῦ Διὸς, μιμησαμένους τὸ διὰ Μωσέως εἰρημένον, ἐκ τῶν προειρημένων νοῆσαι δύνασθε. Ἔφη γὰρ ὁ Μωσῆς, ὡς προεγράψαμεν· Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν· ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος, καὶ πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τῶν ὑδάτων. Εἰς μίμησιν οὖν τοῦ λεχθέντος ἐπιφερομένου τῷ ὕδατι πνεύματος Θεοῦ, τὴν Κόρην θυγατέρα τοῦ Διὸς ἔφασαν. Καὶ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν δὲ ὁμοίως πονηρευόμενοι θυγατέρα τοῦ Διὸς ἔφασαν, οὐκ ἀπὸ μίξεως, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ ἐννοηθέντα τὸν Θεὸν διὰ λόγου τὸν κόσμον ποιῆσαι 12
ἔγνωσαν, ὡς τὴν πρώτην Ἔννοιαν ἔφασαν τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν· ὅπερ γελοιότατον ἡγούμεθα εἶναι, τῆς ἐννοίας εἰκόνα παραφέρειν θηλειῶν μορφήν. Καὶ ὁμοίως τοὺς ἄλλους λεγομένους υἱοὺς τοῦ Διὸς αἱ πράξεις ἐλέγχουσιν.

Returning to his subject, Justin describes the order of celebrating the Eucharist, and the first communion of those newly baptised.

LXV. Ἡμεῖς δὲ μετὰ τὸ οὕτως λοῦσαι τὸν πεπεισμένον καὶ συγκατατεθειμένον, ἐπὶ τοὺς λεγομένους ἀδελφοὺς ἄγομεν, ἔνθα συνηγμένοι εἰσὶ, κοινὰς εὐχὰς ποιησόμενοι ὑπέρ τε ἑαυτῶν, καὶ τοῦ φωτισθέντος, καὶ ἄλλων πανταχοῦ πάν-

LXIV. 5. ὡς προεγράψαμεν. The reference is to c. 59, where Gen. i. 1, 2, has been previously cited.

12. ἐννοηθέντα. *Having been impressed with the idea on his mind.* The import of the participle will be readily conceived by Bishop Kaye's remarks on a corresponding notion entertained by Tatian. See his Justin, p. 164.

LXV. 2. ἐπὶ τοὺς λεγομένους ἀδελφούς. Tertul. Apol. c. 39, *Fratres autem etiam vestri sumus, jure naturæ matris unius: at quanto dignius fratres et dicuntur et habentur, qui unum patrem Deum agnoverunt, qui unum spiritum biberunt sanctitatis, qui de uno utero ignorantiæ ejusdem ad unam lucem aspirarunt veritatis.*

3. κοινὰς εὐχάς. So called, because offered up in the common assembly, and in the common behalf of all sorts and conditions of men. Tertull. Apol. c. 39, *Coimus in cœtum et congregationem, ut ad Deum, quasi manu facta, precationibus ambiamus. Hæc vis Deo grata est. Oramus etiam pro imperatoribus, pro ministris eorum et potestatibus, pro statu sæculi, pro rerum quiete, pro mora finis.* Arnob. c. Gent. IV. *In quibus,* scil. *conventibus, summus oretur Deus, pax cunctis et venia postuletur magistratibus, exercitibus, regibus, familiaribus, inimicis.* Similar passages abound in the early writers. For specimens of these prayers, see the Constt. Apost. VIII. 9 sqq.

των εὐτόνως, ὅπως καταξιωθῶμεν, τὰ ἀληθῆ μαθόντες, καὶ δι' ἔργων ἀγαθοὶ πολιτευταὶ καὶ φύλακες τῶν ἐντεταλμένων εὑρεθῆναι, ὅπως τὴν αἰώνιον σωτηρίαν σωθῶμεν. Ἀλλήλους φιλήματι ἀσπαζόμεθα παυσάμενοι τῶν εὐχῶν. Ἔπειτα προσφέρεται τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος, καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος· καὶ οὗτος λαβὼν αἶνον καὶ δόξαν

6. ἀγαθοὶ πολιτευταί. *Good citizens.* Compare Acts xxiii. 1; Phil. i. 27, iii. 20; and see the Commentators on ll. cc.

7. ἀλλήλους φιλήματι ἀσπαζόμεθα. This token of Christian love was grounded on the Apostolic form of salutation (Rom. xvi. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 12; *et al.*), and appears to have been given at the close of the ordinary worship, before the celebration of the Eucharist. It was not, however, interchanged between persons of different sexes; and every precaution was taken to prevent abuses, to which the practice might possibly give rise. The enemies of Christianity, however, made it a ground of calumny against the brethren, and therefore it was gradually abolished; though vestiges of it are found even as late as the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. See Apost. Const. VIII. 11; Athenag. Legat. c. 32; Clem. Alex. Pæd. III. 11; Tertull. ad Uxor. II. 4; de Orat. c. 14; Origen. Comment. ad Rom. x. 33; Jerom. Epist. 62; Cyril. Hier. Cat. Myst. c. 5; Augustin. Serm. 83; Chrysost. de Compunct. Cord. I. 3; Concil. Laod. Can. 19.

9. τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδ. That is, it should seem, *to the Bishop.* Ignat. Epist. ad Smyrn. c. 8, ἐκείνη βεβαία εὐχαριστία ἡγείσθω, ἡ ὑπὸ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ οὖσα, ἢ ᾧ ἂν αὐτὸς ἐπιτρέψῃ. Tertull. de Cor. Mil. c. 3, *Eucharistiæ sacramentum non de aliorum manu, quam* Præsidentium, *sumimus.* It was the prevailing rule in the early Church that the elements should be consecrated by the bishop, if he were present, and, in his absence only, by the presbyter. This office is assigned in the Constt. Apost. (VIII. 13), either to the ἀρχιερεὺς or the ἐπίσκοπος. A presbyter distributed the bread, and a deacon the cup. In the New Test. the titles προϊστάμενος and προεστὼς seem to indicate *a bishop* or *presiding presbyter*, indifferently. Compare Rom. xii. 8; 1 Thess. v. 12; 1 Tim. v. 17. Thus Tertull. Apol. c. 39, *Præsident in Ecclesia probati quidam seniores, honorem istum non pretio sed testimonio adepti.* Cyprian. Epist. 27, *In literis quas collegæ nostri ad* episcopos *in Numidia* præsidentes *ante fecerunt.* Basil. Hom. in Ps. xxviii. 1, οἱ τῆς ποίμνης τοῦ Χριστοῦ προεστῶτες.

9. ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος. For ὕδατος οἴνῳ κεκραμένου. In the primitive Church the sacramental wine was always mixed with a small quantity of water; and this mixture the Greeks called κρᾶμα (from κεράννυμι), and the Latins *temperamentum calicis* or *calicem mixtūm.* See Iren. Hær. I. 9; IV. 57; V. 2, 36. It was in fact deemed equally heretical to use wine alone as water alone; and the *Armenians* and the *Encratites* were alike condemned for either practice respectively. See Clem. Alex. Pæd. II. 2; Epiphan. Hær. XLVI. 4, 16; Augustin. Hær. 64; Theod. Hær. Fab. I. 20. Writing to Cæcilius against the latter practice, Cyprian (Epist. 63) not only maintains that wine is essential to the sacrament, but seems to regard the tempering of the wine with water as sanctioned by our Lord himself, and supposes that the mixture is emblematical of a mystical union between Christ and the Church, which is dissolved by the absence of either ingredient. Ambrose again explains

τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων, διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, ἀναπέμπει, καὶ εὐχαριστίαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατηξιῶσθαι τούτων παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πολὺ ποιεῖται· οὗ συντελέσαντος τὰς εὐχὰς καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν, πᾶς ὁ παρὼν λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ λέγων, Ἀμήν. Τὸ δὲ Ἀμὴν τῇ Ἑβραΐδι φωνῇ τὸ Γένοιτο σημαίνει. Εὐχαριστήσαντος δὲ τοῦ προεστῶτος, καὶ ἐπευφημήσαντος παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ, οἱ καλούμενοι παρ' ἡμῖν διάκονοι διδόασιν ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσιν ἀποφέρουσι.

LXVI. Καὶ ἡ τροφὴ αὕτη καλεῖται παρ' ἡμῖν Εὐχαριστία· ἧς οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ μετασχεῖν ἐξόν ἐστιν, ἢ τῷ πιστεύοντι

He points out the nature of the sacrament, and the manner of its institution; and adverts to the imitation of it in the mysteries of *Mithras*.

the matter thus, in his treatise *de Sacrament.* v. 1: *Quid sibi vult admixtio aquæ? Quia de latere Christi profluxit sanguis et aqua, ut redimeret. Quare de latere? Quia unde culpa, inde gratia: culpa per fœminam, gratia per dominum Jesum Christum.* Though it is probable, however, that the cup which our Saviour used contained water as well as wine, according to the prevailing custom of the Jews; and although the custom was not only authorized by early usage, but decreed by the third Council of Carthage (c. 23) and other synods, it was rejected at the Reformation as built upon no Scriptural warrant, as not representing any part of the sacrament as ordained by Christ, and as having given rise to a variety of idle questions prejudicial to the peace of the Church. With respect to the practice of the Church of England, see Wheatley *on the Common Prayer*, vi. 10, 5; Palmer's *English Ritual*, iv. 9; and Bingham's *Antiq.* xv. 27.

13. ἐπὶ πολύ. *At considerable length.* Chrysost. in 1 Cor. Hom. 24, οὐ μικρὸν τὸ εἰρημένον· εὐλογίαν γὰρ ὅταν εἴπω, πάντα ἀναπτύσσω τὸν τῆς εὐεργεσίας τοῦ Θεοῦ θησαυρὸν, καὶ τῶν μεγάλων ἐκείνων ἀναμιμνήσκω δωρεῶν.

15. Ἀμήν. See Constt. Apost. viii. 10; Cyril. H. Cat. c. 5; Euseb. H. E. vi. 43; Ambros. de Sacrament. iv. 4; Jerom. Epist. 62. Of the word itself, see the Commentt. on Matt. vi. 13.

19. καὶ οἴνου. A positive testimony, that in Justin's time the sacrament was administered *in both kinds* to the laity as well as clergy: nor was the custom ever varied till the 12th century, when the cup was gradually withdrawn from the people in the Western Church.

20. τοῖς οὐ παροῦσιν ἀποφέρουσι. Persons, who from sickness or other causes were unable to attend, were regarded as present in spirit and sympathy; and portions of the consecrated elements were sent to the invalid or to the imprisoned, in order that they might partake of the benefits of communion. See Bp. Kaye's Justin, iv. 92. That the bread and wine were in these cases also administered alike, Jerome bears testimony in Epist. 4, *Nihil illo ditius, qui corpus Domini canistro vimineo, sanguinem portat in vitro.* Hence it should seem that at this period the bread was distributed from a wicker basket.

LXVI. 1. εὐχαριστία. This was a very early appellation of the Lord's Supper, founded no doubt upon the word applied to the *eucharistic* act of Christ himself at the institution of the sacrament (Matt. xxvi. 27; Mark xiv. 23; Luke xxii. 19;

ἐν τῷ παντὶ, παρὰ Μωσέως λαβὼν ὁμοίως εἶπεν. Ἐν γὰρ ταῖς Μωσέως γραφαῖς ἀναγέγραπται, ὡς κατ' ἐκεῖνο τοῦ καιροῦ ὅτε ἐξῆλθον ἀπὸ Αἰγύπτου οἱ Ἰσραηλῖται, καὶ γεγόνασιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, ἀπήντησαν αὐτοῖς ἰοβόλα θηρία, ἔχιδναί τε καὶ ἀσπίδες καὶ ὄφεων πᾶν γένος, ὃ ἐθανάτου τὸν λαόν· καὶ, κατ' ἐπίπνοιαν καὶ ἐνέργειαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ γενομένην, λαβεῖν τὸν Μωσέα χαλκὸν, καὶ ποιῆσαι τύπον σταυροῦ, καὶ τοῦτον στῆσαι ἐπὶ τῇ ἁγίᾳ σκηνῇ, καὶ εἰπεῖν τῷ λαῷ, Ἐὰν προσβλέπητε τῷ τύπῳ τούτῳ, καὶ πιστεύητε, ἐν αὐτῷ σωθήσεσθε. Καὶ γενομένου τούτου, τοὺς μὲν ὄφεις ἀποθανεῖν ἀνέγραψε, τὸν δὲ λαὸν ἐκφυγεῖν τὸν θάνατον οὕτως παρέδωκεν. Ἃ ἀναγνοὺς Πλάτων, καὶ μὴ ἀκριβῶς ἐπιστάμενος μηδὲ νοήσας τύπον εἶναι σταυροῦ, ἀλλὰ χίασμα νοήσας, τὴν μετὰ τὸν πρῶτον Θεὸν δύναμιν κεχιάσθαι ἐν τῷ παντὶ εἶπε. Καὶ τὸ εἰπεῖν αὐτὸν τρίτον, ἐπειδὴ, ὡς προείπομεν, ἐπάνω τῶν ὑδάτων ἀνέγνω ὑπὸ Μωσέως εἰρημένον ἐπιφέρεσθαι τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ πνεῦμα. Δευτέραν μὲν γὰρ χώραν τῷ παρὰ Θεοῦ λόγῳ, ὃν κεχιάσθαι ἐν τῷ παντὶ ἔφη, δίδωσι· τὴν δὲ τρίτην τῷ λεχθέντι

Mosaic account of the elevation of the brazen serpent in the wilderness; for, though it is clear from John iii. 14, that the pole, on which the serpent was suspended, was a *τύπος σταυροῦ*, or, as Tertullian (de Idol. c. 5) observes, *figuram designasse dominicæ crucis*, there is nothing in the narrative in Numb. xxi. 6 sqq., to lead Plato to such a conclusion. Neither is it recorded in Scripture, that Moses placed the figure upon the holy tabernacle; but Justin, assuming this point, and, like many of the Fathers, regarding the tabernacle as an emblem of the universe, would readily allow his imagination to connect the Platonic sign of the letter X with the typical figure erected in the wilderness. This idea of the tabernacle was entertained by Philo (V. Mos. III. 3) and Josephus (Ant. III. 7, 7). Compare Justin's Cohort. ad Græc. c. 29. Of the typical character of the brazen serpent, see also Dial. Tryph. cc. 94, 112; S. Barnab. Epist. Cathol. c. 12; Tertul. adv. Jud. c. 10.

9. *γενομένην*. *Vulgo* λεγομένην. A similar confusion has been rectified in c. 54.

14. *ἃ ἀναγνοὺς Π.* In the MSS. and earlier edd. the punctuation is at *θάνατον*, and the new period commences with Οὕτως παρέδωκεν ἀναγνοὺς Πλ. κ. τ. λ. For *οὕτως* Davies suggested *τοῦτο*; but with the new pointing introduced by Grabe, and the insertion of the relative *ἃ* which had been hastily omitted by the copyists, Thirlby has completed the restoration of the passage.

17. *καὶ τὸ εἰπεῖν αὐτὸν τρίτον.* Supply *μάθετε*, from the commencement of the last chapter.

18. *ὡς προείπομεν.* The reference is to Gen. i. 2, quoted in c. 59.

ἐπιφέρεσθαι τῷ ὕδατι πνεύματι, εἰπὼν, Τὰ δὲ τρίτα περὶ τὸν τρίτον. Καὶ ὡς ἐκπύρωσιν γενήσεσθαι διὰ Μωσέως προεμήνυσε τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα, ἀκούσατε. Ἔφη δὲ οὕτως· Καταβήσεται ἀείζωον πῦρ, καὶ καταφάγεται μέχρι τῆς ἀβύσσου κάτω. Οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ οὖν ἡμεῖς ἄλλοις δοξάζομεν, ἀλλ' οἱ πάντες τὰ ἡμέτερα μιμούμενοι λέγουσι. Παρ' ἡμῖν οὖν ἔστι ταῦτα ἀκοῦσαι καὶ μαθεῖν παρὰ τῶν οὐδὲ τοὺς χαρακτῆρας τῶν στοιχείων ἐπισταμένων, ἰδιωτῶν μὲν καὶ βαρβάρων τὸ φθέγμα, σοφῶν δὲ καὶ πιστῶν τὸν νοῦν ὄντων, καὶ πηρῶν καὶ χήρων τινῶν τὰς ὄψεις. Ὡς συνεῖναι οὐ σοφίᾳ ἀνθρωπείᾳ ταῦτα γεγονέναι, ἀλλὰ δυνάμει Θεοῦ λέγεσθαι.

The concluding chapters of the Apology are devoted to an exposition of the nature and object of the Christian Sacraments: and first of *Baptism*; the manner of performing the rite, the reason and necessity of its observance, and the benefits which it communicates.

LXI. Ὃν τρόπον δὲ καὶ ἀνεθήκαμεν ἑαυτοὺς τῷ Θεῷ καινοποιηθέντες διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐξηγησόμεθα, ὅπως μὴ, τοῦτο παραλιπόντες, δόξωμεν πονηρεύειν τι ἐν τῇ ἐξηγήσει. Ὅσοι ἂν πεισθῶσι καὶ πιστεύωσιν ἀληθῆ ταῦτα τὰ ὑφ' ἡμῶν

22. τὰ δὲ τρίτα περὶ τὸν τρίτον. Plat. Epist. 2, ad Dionysium (T. xi. p. 69, ed. Bipont.): περὶ τὸν πάντων βασιλέα πάντ' ἐστὶ, καὶ ἐκείνου ἕνεκα πάντα, καὶ ἐκεῖνο αἴτιον ἁπάντων τῶν καλῶν· δεύτερον δὲ πέρι, τὰ δεύτερα· καὶ τρίτον πέρι, τὰ τρίτα. By the punctuation of this difficult passage which is here adopted, the sense accords with the form in which it is given by Justin. Compare Procli Theol. Platon. ii. 11. However interpreted, it affords undoubted evidence of Justin's belief in the distinct personality of the Holy Spirit. See on c. 6, 5. At the same time it is utterly impossible, as Bishop Kaye remarks, that Justin should have originally deduced his notions respecting the Trinity from sources such as these. It should also be noted, that the Epistle to Dionysius is unquestionably spurious. See Ast, on the *Life and Writings of Plato.*

25. καταβήσεται ἀείζωον πῦρ κ. τ. λ. From Deut. xxxii. 22.

27. τὰ ἡμέτερα μιμούμενοι. Tertull. Apol. c. 46, *Mimicè philosophi adfectant veritatem, et adfectando corrumpunt.* See on cc. 5, 18; 20, 6; 44, 21.

28. παρ' ἡμῖν οὖν ἐστὶ κ. τ. λ. Hence Iren. Hær. iii. 4, *Hanc fidem qui sine literis crediderunt, quantum ad sermonem nostrum barbari sunt, quantum autem ad sententiam et consuetudinem et conversationem propter fidem perquam sapientissimi sunt, et placent Deo, conversantes in omni justitia et castitate et sapientia.* Tertul. Apol. c. 46, *Deum quilibet opifex Christianus et invenit et ostendit, et exinde totum, quod a Deo quæritur, se quoque assignat; licet Plato affirmet factitatorem universitatis neque inveniri facilem, et inventum enarrari in omnes difficilem.* Compare Athenag. Legat. c. 11.

31. ὡς συνεῖναι κ. τ. λ. Lactant. Institt. Div. ii. 3, *Verum scire, divinæ est sapientiæ: homo autem per se ipsum pervenire ad hanc scientiam non potest, nisi doceatur a Deo.* Compare 1 Cor. ii. 4, 5.—For συνεῖναι, it is unnecessary to read συνιέναι, with Braunius and others. See on c. 14, 3.

LXI. 1. ἀνεθήκαμεν ἑαυτοὺς κ. τ. λ. See above on c. 49.

4. ὑφ' ἡμῶν διδασκόμενα. So in c. 66, τὰ δεδιδαγμένα ὑφ' ἡμῶν. In the

διδασκόμενα καὶ λεγόμενα εἶναι, καὶ βιοῦν οὕτως δύνασθαι ὑπισχνῶνται, εὔχεσθαί τε καὶ αἰτεῖν νηστεύοντες παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν προημαρτημένων ἄφεσιν διδάσκονται, ἡμῶν συνευχομένων καὶ συννηστευόντων αὐτοῖς. Ἔπειτα ἄγονται ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἔνθα ὕδωρ ἐστὶ, καὶ τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως, ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἀνεγεννήθημεν, ἀναγεννῶνται. Ἐπ' ὀνόματος γὰρ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ δεσπότου Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ

early editions the preposition is ἐφ', which is manifestly incorrect.—In order to prepare the candidate for baptism, he went through a course of catechetical instruction, varying in some degree according to the age and condition of the catechumen. The nature of this preparation will be seen in the forms prescribed by the Apostolical Constitutions; and a complete summary of Christian faith and practice, as taught by the early Church, will be found in the *Catechetical Discourses* of Cyril of Jerusalem. Of Justin's views on the subject of Baptism, see Bp. Kaye's work, chap. 4, pp. 84, 90.

6. νηστεύοντες. Grabe compares Constt. Apost. VII. 22, πρὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος νηστευσάτω ὁ βαπτιζόμενος. It will be observed that Justin speaks of remission of sins in baptism as extending only to those previously committed (τῶν προημαρτημένων ἄφεσιν). So again in what follows, ὅπως ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτιῶν ὑπὲρ ὧν προημάρτομεν τύχωμεν. Compare Dial. Tryph. c. 86; Clem. Alex. Strom. II. 13, 58; IV. 24, 156; Origen. Hom. in Jud. VII. 2; Select. in Jerem. III. 7; Tertull. de Baptism. cc. 8, 15; Cyprian. de Dei Grat. c. 4; De Op. et Eleemos. c. 1.

9. ἔνθα ὕδωρ ἐστί. With respect to the place of baptism, the disciples of John the Baptist and of Jesus were baptised by *immersion* in the river Jordan or any other stream of water (Matt. iii. 6; Acts viii. 36; xvi. 13, 15); and possibly by *aspersion* in houses (Acts ix. 18; x. 47; xvi. 33). It seems from this place, that in the early days of the Church a similar practice prevailed: and thus the Clementine Homilies (IX. 19) speak of "a river, a fountain, or the sea," as suitable for performing the rite according to circumstances; and Tertullian (de Bapt. c. 4) considers it immaterial whether a person was baptised "in the sea, or in standing or running water, or in fountain, lake, or river." Baptisteries were very general in the fifth and sixth centuries; but the periods at which they were attached to churches, and superseded by fonts, is not precisely known. See Ambros. de Sacram. III. 2, 3; August. Civ. D. XXII. 8.

9. τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως, κ. τ. λ. The antient Fathers agree with Justin in identifying regeneration, and the *laver of regeneration* (λουτρὸν ἀναγεννήσεως), with baptism. See Iren. Hær. II. 22, 4; Clem. Alex. Pædag. I. 6; Tertul. de Bapt. cc. 5, 7, 16. Compare Tit. iii. 5.

10. ἐπ' ὀνόματος γὰρ τοῦ πατρὸς κ. τ. λ. Justin here manifestly alludes to the baptismal formula prescribed by Christ himself (Matt. xxviii. 19); and there was never any variation from it in the early Church. The Apostolical Constitutions (III. 16) and Canons (c. 49) enjoin its use under heavy penalties; and Tertullian (de Bapt. c. 13) speaks of it as *lex tingendi imposita et forma præscripta.* Compare Iren. Hær. III. 19; Tertul. adv. Prax. c. 26; Cyprian. Epist. 73; Augustin. de Bapt. VI. 25; Ambros. de Sacrament. *in fine.* See also Bingham's *Christian Antiquities*, B. II. c. 3.

σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου, τὸ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι τότε λουτρὸν ποιοῦνται. Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν· Ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. Ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἀδύνατον εἰς τὰς μήτρας τῶν τεκουσῶν τοὺς ἅπαξ γεννωμένους ἐμβῆναι, φανερὸν πᾶσίν ἐστι. Καὶ διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου, ὡς προεγράψαμεν, εἴρηται τίνα τρόπον φεύξονται τὰς ἁμαρτίας οἱ ἁμαρτήσαντες καὶ μετανοοῦντες. Ἐλέχθη δὲ οὕτως· Λούσασθε, καθαροὶ γένεσθε, ἀφέλετε τὰς πονηρίας ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν, μάθετε καλὸν ποιεῖν, κρίνατε ὀρφανῷ καὶ δικαιώσατε χήραν· καὶ δεῦτε, καὶ διαλεχθῶμεν, λέγει κύριος. Καὶ ἐὰν ὦσιν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ὑμῶν ὡς φοινικοῦν, ὡσεὶ ἔριον λευκανῶ· καὶ ἐὰν ὦσιν ὡς κόκκινον, ὡς χιόνα λευκανῶ. Ἐὰν δὲ μὴ εἰσακούσητέ μου, μάχαιρα ὑμᾶς κατέδεται· τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου ἐλάλησε ταῦτα. Καὶ λόγον δὲ εἰς τοῦτο παρὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐμάθομεν τοῦτον. Ἐπειδὴ τὴν πρώτην γένεσιν ἡμῶν ἀγνοοῦντες, κατ' ἀνάγκην γεγεννήμεθα ἐξ ὑγρᾶς σπορᾶς κατὰ μίξιν τὴν τῶν γονέων πρὸς ἀλλήλους, καὶ ἐν ἔθεσι φαύλοις καὶ πονηραῖς ἀνατροφαῖς γεγόναμεν, ὅπως μὴ ἀνάγκης τέκνα μηδὲ ἀγνοίας μένωμεν, ἀλλὰ προαιρέσεως καὶ ἐπιστήμης, ἀφέσεώς τε ἁμαρτιῶν ὑπὲρ ὧν προημάρτομεν τύχωμεν ἐν τῷ ὕδατι, ἐπονομάζεται τῷ ἑλομένῳ ἀναγεννηθῆναι, καὶ μετανοήσαντι ἐπὶ τοῖς ἡμαρτημένοις, τὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ δεσπότου Θεοῦ ὄνομα· αὐτὸ τοῦτο

14. *ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε κ. τ. λ.* From John iii. 3 sqq. For *γεννωμένους*, of which there is no reason to doubt the genuineness, the Cod. Clar. has *γενομένους*, with *γεννηθέντας* in the margin.

17. *ὡς προεγράψαμεν.* The reference is to c. 44, where the same passage from Isaiah (i. 16 sqq.) is cited, but for a different purpose.

27. *ἐπειδὴ τὴν πρώτην γένεσιν κ. τ. λ.* There is no allusion in this passage, as some have thought, to the doctrine of *original sin*, but merely to the corrupting influence of education and example. It will be observed also, that the second birth spoken of depends upon the *will* of each individual, and consequently implies that the baptised person is an adult. See, however, on c. 15, 17, and Bp. Kaye's Justin, p. 76. With respect to original sin, there is another passage (Dial. Tryph. c. 100,) in which an allusion to it has been imagined, but without any apparent grounds. For *γεγεννήμεθα* the Benedictine edition has *γεγενήμεθα*, which is not the reading of either MS.

35. *αὐτὸ τ. μ. ἐπιλέγοντος τοῦ τὸν λ. ἄγοντος ἑ. τ. λ.* This is the easy and elegant emendation of Thirlby, which Otto had previously admitted into the text. The vulgar reading is *ἐπιλέγοντες, τοῦτον λ. ἄγοντες ἑ. τ. λ.* Sylburg proposes *καὶ αὐτὸ* and *ἄγομεν*, omitting *τοῦ*, and Grabe suggests *τούτῳ, scil.*

μόνον ἐπιλέγοντος τοῦ τὸν λουσόμενον ἄγοντος ἐπὶ τὸ λουτρόν. Ὄνομα γὰρ τῷ ἀῤῥήτῳ Θεῷ οὐδεὶς ἔχει εἰπεῖν· εἰ δέ τις τολμήσειεν εἶναι λέγειν, μέμηνε τὴν ἄσωτον μανίαν. Καλεῖται δὲ τοῦτο τὸ λουτρὸν φωτισμὸς, ὡς φωτιζομένων τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν ταῦτα μανθανόντων. Καὶ ἐπ' ὀνόματος δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σταυρωθέντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ ἐπ' ὀνόματος πνεύματος ἁγίου, ὃ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν προεκήρυξε τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν πάντα, ὁ φωτιζόμενος λούεται.

Deo. Having mentioned the *name of God*, Justin, before he concludes the baptismal formula, starts off, in his usual digressive manner, into an explanation of the sense in which the expression is to be understood; and then again into another of the import of *τὸ λουτρὸν*, mentioned in the first digression.—Of the *namelessness* of God, see above on c. 10, 6.

39. *φωτισμός.* This term is very generally applied to baptism by the early Christian writers, and Justin here explains it with reference to the *illumination* of the minds of the *catechumens* by the instruction which they received in the principles of the Christian religion before the rite was administered to them. Clemens Alexandrinus, however, in enumerating the several names by which the sacrament was designated, refers it to a certain inward illumination communicated by the ordinance itself. Thus Pædagog. I. 6, 26, *Καλεῖται πολλαχῶς τὸ ἔργον τοῦτο· χάρισμα, καὶ φώτισμα, καὶ τέλειον, καὶ λουτρόν. Λουτρὸν μὲν, δι' οὗ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἀποῤῥυπτόμεθα· χάρισμα δὲ, ᾧ τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἁμαρτήμασιν ἐπιτίμια ἀνεῖται· φώτισμα δὲ, δι' οὗ τὸ ἅγιον ἐκεῖνο φῶς σωτήριον ἐποπτεύεται, τουτέστι, δι' οὗ τὸ θεῖον ὀξυωποῦμεν· τέλειον δὲ, τὸ ἀπροσδεὲς φαμέν.* He had previously said, *βαπτιζόμενοι φωτιζόμεθα· φωτιζόμενοι υἱοποιούμεθα· υἱοποιούμενοι τελειούμεθα· τελειούμενοι ἀπαθανατιζόμεθα.* Elsewhere, however, Clement seems to apply the term to the instruction preparatory to baptism; as in Strom. v. 684, 26, *διὰ τοῦτι φωτισμὸς ἡ μαθητεία κέκληται.* The term has been thought to have originated in the use of the verb *φωτίζεσθαι* by St. Paul, in Eph. i. 18, iii. 9; Heb. vi. 4, x. 32. Hence Chrysostom in his Catechism *πρὸς τοὺς μέλλοντας φωτίζεσθαι*, c. 1: *καλεῖται καὶ φώτισμα· καὶ τοῦτο αὐτὸ Παῦλος αὐτὸς ἐκάλεσε.* From the word thus applied the baptistery was sometimes called *φωτιστήριον.* It has been observed, that the Fathers generally called those already baptised *φωτιζόμενοι*, and the catechumens *φωτισθέντες.* If so, Justin is clearly an exception to the rule, for the catechumens are here called *φωτιζόμενοι*, and in c. 65, *φωτισθεὶς* is applied to a baptised person. Perhaps the terms were used indifferently, with reference to the *illumination* essential to baptism, rather than to the rite itself. For *φωτιζομένων*, it has been proposed to read *φώτιζον μὲν*, and in the end of the clause Thirlby maintains that beyond all doubt the true reading must be *τῶν αὐτοῦ μετασχόντων.* No change whatever is required, if indeed it be admissible; even the substitution of *μαθόντων* for *μανθανόντων* being a mere unnecessary conjecture. The words *τῶν ταῦτα μανθανόντων* bear, as Otto observes, a manifest reference to *τὰ ὑφ' ἡμῶν διδασκόμενα*, in the beginning of the chapter.

LXII. Καὶ τὸ λουτρὸν δὴ τοῦτο ἀκούσαντες οἱ δαίμονες διὰ τοῦ προφήτου κεκηρυγμένον, ἐνήργησαν καὶ ῥαντίζειν ἑαυτοὺς τοὺς εἰς τὰ ἱερὰ αὐτῶν ἐπιβαίνοντας καὶ προσιέναι αὐτοῖς μέλλοντας, λοιβὰς καὶ κνίσας ἀποτελοῦντας· τέλεον δὲ καὶ λούεσθαι ἀπιόντας πρὶν ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὰ ἱερά, ἔνθα ἵδρυνται, ἐνεργοῦσι. Καὶ γὰρ τὸ ὑπολύεσθαι ἐπιβαίνοντας τοῖς ἱεροῖς, καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς τοὺς θρησκεύοντας, κελεύεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἱερατευόντων, ἐκ τῶν συμβάντων Μωσεῖ τῷ εἰρημένῳ προφήτῃ μαθόντες οἱ δαίμονες ἐμιμήσαντο. Κατ' ἐκεῖνο γὰρ τοῦ καιροῦ, ὅτε Μωσῆς ἐκελεύσθη κατελθὼν εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐξαγαγεῖν τὸν ἐκεῖ λαὸν τῶν Ἰσραηλιτῶν, ποιμαίνοντος αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ Ἀραβικῇ γῇ πρόβατα

In a digression of some length, Justin observes that the dæmons, in furtherance of their seductive plans, suggested the introduction of washings and sprinklings into the heathen worship, in imitation of Christian baptism; as they had also, from Christ's injunction to Moses from the burning bush, required that those who entered their temples should put off their shoes.

LXII. 2. διὰ τοῦ προφήτου. The reference is doubtless to the passage of Isaiah quoted in the last chapter. Justin, however, has been supposed to allude to Ezek. xxxvi. 25.

2. ἐνήργησαν καὶ ῥαντίζειν ἑαυτοὺς κ. τ. λ. Tertull. de Præscr. c. 40, *Ipsas quoque res sacramentorum divinorum in idolorum mysteriis imitatur* Diabolus. *Tingit et ipse quosdam, utique credentes et fideles nos; expiationem delictorum de lavacro repromittit.* De Bapt. c. 5, *Nationes, extraneæ ab omni intellectu spiritualium, potestatem eadem efficacia idolis suis subministrant, sed viduis aquis sibi mentiuntur. Nam et sacris quibusdam per lavacrum initiantur Isidis alicujus, aut Mithræ.* Augustin. de Bapt. c. Donatist. vi. 25, *In multis idolorum sacrilegis sacris baptizati homines perhibentur.* Compare Chrysost. Hom. in Matt. ii. To the ablutions of the heathens as a religious ceremony there are frequent allusions in their poets. Thus Hesiod. Op. D. 724, Μηδέ ποτ' ἐξ ἠοῦς Διῒ λείβειν αἴθοπα οἶνον Χερσὶν ἀνίπτοισι, μηδ' ἄλλοις ἀθανάτοισιν· Οὐ γὰρ τοίγε κλύουσιν, ἀποπτύουσι δέ τ' ἀράς. See also my notes on Hom. Il. A. 499, Z. 266.

5. τέλεον δὲ καὶ λούεσθαι κ. τ. λ. *Multa hic sed inutili labore Thirlbius excogitat; videlicet opinatur legendum ἐν τέλεσι pro τέλεον, aut ἅπαντας sive ἱερατεύοντας pro ἀπιόντας, aut ἐνήργ. καὶ ῥαντ. ἑ. τοὺς προσιέναι αὐτοῖς μ. λοιβ. καὶ κν. ἀποτ. τέλεον δὲ καὶ λούεσθαι ἅπαντας τοὺς εἰς τὰ ἱερὰ αὐτῶν ἐπιβ. πρὶν ἐλθεῖν κ. τ. λ.* Otto. Grabe refers to the note of Grotius on Matt. xxviii. 19. The words may be rendered, *They cause them also to wash themselves entirely, as they depart* from the sacrifice, *before they enter into* those parts of *the temples in which their images are placed.*

6. τὸ ὑπολύεσθαι. *Scil.* τὰ ἀποδήματα αὐτῶν. To the custom of the heathen of walking *barefoot* on certain occasions of religious ceremony, Tertullian alludes in Apol. c. 40, and adv. Psych. c. 16. Without adducing other instances, it may be observed that the disciple of Pythagoras was enjoined θύειν ἀνυπόδετον, καὶ πρὸς ἱερὰ προσιέναι. See Iamblich. v. Pyth. cc. 89, 105.

7. αὐτοῖς. Sylburg would read ναοῖς, Thirlby ἀδύτοις, and Braunius, with whom Otto coincides, τοιούτοις. No change seems to be necessary; and Grabe is correct in understanding τοῖς αὐτοῖς of *the dæmons* themselves. Compare cc. 5, 9.

τοῦ πρὸς μητρὸς θείου, ἐν ἰδέᾳ πυρὸς ἐκ βάτου προσωμίλησεν αὐτῷ ὁ ἡμέτερος Χριστὸς, καὶ εἶπεν, Ὑπόλυσαι τὰ ὑποδήματά σου, καὶ προσελθὼν ἄκουσον. Ὁ δὲ, ὑπολυσάμενος καὶ προσελθὼν, ἀκήκοε κατελθεῖν εἰς Αἴγυπτον, καὶ ἐξαγαγεῖν τὸν ἐκεῖ λαὸν τῶν Ἰσραηλιτῶν, καὶ δύναμιν ἰσχυρὰν ἔλαβε παρὰ τοῦ λαλήσαντος αὐτῷ ἐν ἰδέᾳ πυρὸς Χριστοῦ, καὶ κατελθὼν ἐξήγαγε τὸν λαὸν, ποιήσας μεγάλα καὶ θαυμάσια· ἃ εἰ βούλεσθε μαθεῖν, ἐκ τῶν συγγραμμάτων ἐκείνου ἀκριβῶς μαθήσεσθε.

Taking occasion to animadvert upon the blindness of the Jews, who conceived that it was God the Father, not the Son, who manifested himself to Moses and the Prophets; he thence infers that they knew not either the Father or the Son.

LXIII. Ἰουδαῖοι δὲ πάντες καὶ νῦν διδάσκουσι τὸν ἀνωνόμαστον Θεὸν λελαληκέναι τῷ Μωσεῖ· ὅθεν τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προμεμηνυμένου προφήτου ἐλέγχον αὐτοὺς, ὡς προεγράψαμεν, εἶπεν, Ἔγνω βοῦς τὸν κτησάμενον, καὶ ὄνος τὴν φάτνην τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ· Ἰσραὴλ

13. τοῦ πρὸς μητρὸς θείου. Here is another of Justin's historical inaccuracies. Jethro was not the *maternal uncle*, but the father-in-law of Moses (Exod. ii. 21, iii. 1); and it is not improbable that, as Thirlby conjectures, the mistake arose from a confusion in the writer's mind between Moses and Jacob. To the latter, while feeding the flock of Laban, his father-in-law, a divine appearance was vouchsafed; and this father-in-law was also his mother's brother. See Gen. xxix. 10, xxx. 29.

13. προσωμίλησεν αὐτῷ ὁ ἡμέτερος Χρ. This opinion is more fully developed in Dial. Tryph. cc. 60, 127. And not only Justin, but most of the Ante-Nicene and many later Fathers, maintained that the divine Personage who appeared to the Patriarchs and Prophets of the Old Testament, was not the Father, but the Son, the Incarnate Word of the New Testament, who suffered death for the redemption of mankind. Thus Iren. Hær. IV. 23, *Inseminatus est ubique in Scripturis Filius Dei, aliquando quidem cum Abraham loquens, aliquando cum Noë, dans eis mensuras; aliquando autem quærens Adam, aliquando autem Sodomitis inducens judicium, et rursus cum videretur et in viam dirigit Jacob, et de rubo loquitur cum Mose.* Tertull. c. Marcion. II. 27, *Profitemur Christum semper egisse in Dei Patris nomine, ipsum ab initio conversatum, ipsum congressum cum patriarchis et prophetis. Ille est qui descendit, ille qui interrogat, ille qui postulat, ille qui jurat.* See also Theophil. ad Autol. II. 22; Iren. Hær. III. 6, IV. 11, 17, 37; Tertull. adv. Prax. cc. 14 sqq.; adv. Jud. c. 9; de Præscr. Hær. c. 13; adv. Mar. c. III. 6, V. 9; de Carn. Christ. c. 6; Origen. c. Cels. VI.; Euseb. Hist. Eccl. I. 2; Dem. Ev. I. 5, V. 9; Novatian. de Trin. cc. 25 sqq.; Cyril. Hier. Cat. c. 10; Chrysost. in Gen. Hom. 41, 42, 58; Theodor. in Gen. Qu. 92, in Exod. Qu. 5; Prudent. Apoth. v. 28 sqq. The same opinion is still very generally held among divines. See Bp. Bull's Def. Fid. Nic. I. 1, 3.

14. ὑπόλυσαι τὰ ἀποδήματα κ. τ. λ. From Exod. iii. 5.

LXIII. 1. ἀνωνόμαστον Θεόν. See above, on c. 10, 6.

4. ἐλέγχον αὐτούς. The Benedictine editor has incorrectly printed ἐλέγχων. With respect to the reference, ὡς προεγράψαμεν, the prophecy cited from Isaiah (i. 3) had been previously adduced in c. 37.

δέ με οὐκ ἔγνω, καὶ ὁ λαός με οὐ συνῆκε. Καὶ Ἰησοῦς δὲ ὁ Χριστὸς, ὅτι οὐκ ἔγνωσαν Ἰουδαῖοι τί πατὴρ καὶ τί υἱὸς, ὁμοίως ἐλέγχων αὐτοὺς καὶ αὐτὸς εἶπεν, Οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα, εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός· οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ, καὶ οἷς ἂν ἀποκαλύψῃ ὁ υἱός. Ὁ λόγος δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ, ὡς προέφημεν. Καὶ ἄγγελος δὲ καλεῖται, καὶ ἀπόστολος· αὐτὸς γὰρ ἀπαγγέλλει ὅσα δεῖ γνωσθῆναι, καὶ ἀποστέλλεται μηνύσων ὅσα ἀγγέλλεται, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν εἶπεν· Ὁ ἐμοῦ ἀκούων, ἀκούει τοῦ ἀποστείλαντός με. Καὶ ἐκ τῶν τοῦ Μωσέως δὲ συγγραμμάτων φανερὸν τοῦτο γενήσεται. Λέλεκται δὲ ἐν αὐτοῖς οὕτως· Καὶ ἐλάλησε Μωσεῖ ἄγγελος Θεοῦ ἐν φλογὶ πυρὸς ἐκ τῆς βάτου, καὶ εἶπεν, Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν, Θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ, Θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ, Θεὸς Ἰακὼβ, ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων σου· κάτελθε εἰς Αἴγυπτον, καὶ ἐξάγαγε τὸν λαόν μου. Τὰ δ' ἑπόμενα ἐξ ἐκείνων βουλόμενοι μαθεῖν δύνασθε· οὐ γὰρ δυνατὸν ἐν τούτοις ἀναγράψαι πάντα. Ἀλλ' εἰς ἀπόδειξιν γεγόνασιν οἵδε οἱ λόγοι, ὅτι υἱὸς Θεοῦ καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός ἐστι, πρότερον λόγος ὢν, καὶ ἐν ἰδέᾳ πυρὸς ποτὲ φανεὶς, ποτὲ δὲ καὶ ἐν εἰκόνι ἀσωμάτων· νῦν δὲ διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου γένους ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος,

8. *οὐδεὶς ἔγνω κ. τ. λ.* Compare Matt. xi. 27. It is curious to observe that in this quotation, as twice given in this chapter, the words *πατὴρ* and *υἱὸς* are inverted; and so as in some degree to pervert the sense.

11. *ὡς προέφημεν.* In c. 32, 35.

11. *ἄγγελος δὲ καλεῖται, κ. τ. λ.* So in Dial. Tryph. c. 56, *ἐστὶ καὶ Θεὸς, ὃς καὶ ἄγγελος καλεῖται, διὰ τὸ ἀγγέλλειν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὅσαπερ βούλεται αὐτοῖς ἀγγεῖλαι ὁ τῶν ὅλων ποιητής.* And again: *εἷς τῶν τριῶν ἐκείνων καὶ ὁ Θεός ἐστι καὶ ἄγγελος καλεῖται, ἐκ τοῦ ἀγγέλλειν, ὡς προέφην, οὕσπερ βούλεται, τὰ παρ' αὐτοῦ ὁ τῶν ὅλων ποιητὴς Θεός.* See above, on c. 62, 13; and compare Gen. xxxi. 11, 13, xxxii. 24, 28; Exod. iii. 2, 6, 16; Malach. iii. 1. —For *ἀπαγγέλλει*, both MSS. have *παραγέλλει* in the margin, and R. Stephens deems it the true reading; but the verb *ἀπαγγέλλειν*, which signifies *nuntiare quæ ab alio acceperis*, is equally suited to the context. Of the title *ἀπόστολος*, as applied to Christ, see on c. 12, 32. Since it is only so used in the text there cited, it follows that the Epistle to the Hebrews was known and received by Justin.

14. *ὁ ἐμοῦ ἀκούων κ. τ. λ.* Compare Matt. x. 40.

17. *καὶ ἐλάλησε Μωσεῖ κ. τ. λ.* From Exod. iii. 2, 6, 10, 14, 15. See Bishop Kaye's Justin, ch. 2, pp. 60 sqq.

25. *ἐν εἰκόνι ἀσωμάτων.* Towards the end of the chapter the expression is varied into *εἰκόνος ἀσωμάτου*; whence the Benedictine editor would here also read *εἰκόνι ἀσωμάτῳ.* Though a possible, this is by no means, as Braunius

ὑπέμεινε καὶ παθεῖν ὅσα αὐτὸν ἐνήργησαν οἱ δαίμονες διατεθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνοήτων Ἰουδαίων· οἵτινες ἔχοντες ῥητῶς εἰρημένον ἐν τοῖς Μωσέως συντάγμασι, Καὶ ἐλάλησεν ἄγγελος τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ Μωσεῖ ἐν πυρὶ φλογὸς ἐν βάτῳ, καὶ εἶπεν· Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὤν, ὁ Θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰακὼβ, τὸν τῶν ὅλων πατέρα καὶ δημιουργὸν τὸν ταῦτα εἰπόντα λέγουσιν εἶναι. Ὅθεν καὶ τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα, ἐλέγχον αὐτοὺς, εἶπεν, Ἰσραὴλ δέ με οὐκ ἔγνω, καὶ ὁ λαός με οὐ συνῆκε. Καὶ πάλιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ὡς ἐδηλώσαμεν, παρ' αὐτοῖς ὢν εἶπεν, Οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα, εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός· οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ, καὶ οἷς ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ. Ἰουδαῖοι οὖν ἡγησάμενοι ἀεὶ τὸν πατέρα τῶν ὅλων λελαληκέναι τῷ Μωσεῖ, τοῦ λαλήσαντος αὐτῷ ὄντος υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὃς καὶ ἄγγελος καὶ ἀπόστολος κέκληται, δικαίως ἐλέγχονται καὶ διὰ τοῦ προφητικοῦ πνεύματος καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς οὔτε τὸν πατέρα οὔτε τὸν υἱὸν ἔγνωσαν. Οἱ γὰρ τὸν υἱὸν πατέρα φάσκοντες εἶναι, ἐλέγχονται μήτε τὸν πατέρα ἐπιστάμενοι, μήθ' ὅτι ἐστὶν υἱὸς τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων γινώσκοντες· ὃς καὶ λόγος πρωτότοκος ὢν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ Θεὸς ὑπάρχει. Καὶ πρότερον διὰ τῆς τοῦ πυρὸς μορφῆς καὶ εἰκόνος ἀσωμάτου τῷ Μωσεῖ καὶ τοῖς ἑτέροις προφήταις ἐφάνη· νῦν δ' ἐν χρόνοις τῆς ἡμετέρας ἀρχῆς, ὡς προείπομεν, διὰ παρθένου ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς βουλὴν, ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας τῶν πιστευόντων αὐτῷ καὶ ἐξουθενηθῆναι καὶ παθεῖν ὑπέμεινεν, ἵνα ἀποθανὼν καὶ ἀναστὰς νικήσῃ τὸν θάνατον. Τὸ δὲ εἰρημένον ἐκ βάτου τῷ Μωσεῖ, Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὤν, ὁ Θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰακὼβ, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων σου, σημαντικὸν τοῦ καὶ ἀποθανόντας ἐκείνους

observes, a necessary emendation. Indeed it is more than probable that Justin may have purposely diversified his former designation. It is clear that the *angels* are intended; and that *ἐνσωμάτων*, which has been offered as a conjectural reading, is altogether out of place.

45. ὃς καὶ λόγος πρωτότοκος κ. τ. λ. *Fortasse* λόγος καὶ πρωτότοκος. *Sic supra*, c. 23, Ἰ. Χ. λόγος αὐτοῦ ὑπάρχων καὶ πρωτότοκος. *Et in Dial.* c. 125, Θεοῦ δὲ, ἐκ τοῦ εἶναι τέκνον πρωτότοκον τῶν ὅλων κτισμάτων. THIRLBY. So Otto; who observes, however, that as the vulgar reading may be genuine, he ventures not to disturb it. Grabe directs attention to the testimony here offered to the *divinity of Christ;* and refers to an anonymous author in Eusebius (H. E. v. 28), who cites this passage among others, ἐν οἷς θεολογεῖται ὁ Χριστός.

μένειν, καὶ εἶναι αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀνθρώπους. Καὶ γὰρ πρῶτοι τῶν πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἐκεῖνοι περὶ Θεοῦ ζήτησιν ἠσχολήθησαν, Ἀβραὰμ μὲν πατὴρ ὢν τοῦ Ἰσαάκ, Ἰσαὰκ δὲ τοῦ Ἰακώβ, ὡς καὶ Μωσῆς ἀνέγραψε.

By a misrepresentation of the Mosaic history, Proserpine and Minerva were exalted into daughters of Jupiter: the one had a statue by the brink of fountains, and the other was regarded as the *First Intelligence* of the Creator.

LXIV. *Καὶ τὸ ἀνεγείρειν δὲ τὸ εἴδωλον τῆς λεγομένης Κόρης ἐπὶ ταῖς τῶν ὑδάτων πηγαῖς ἐνεργῆσαι τοὺς δαίμονας, λέγοντας θυγατέρα αὐτὴν εἶναι τοῦ Διός, μιμησαμένους τὸ διὰ Μωσέως εἰρημένον, ἐκ τῶν προειρημένων νοῆσαι δύνασθε. Ἔφη γὰρ ὁ Μωσῆς, ὡς προεγράψαμεν· Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν· ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος, καὶ πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τῶν ὑδάτων. Εἰς μίμησιν οὖν τοῦ λεχθέντος ἐπιφερομένου τῷ ὕδατι πνεύματος Θεοῦ, τὴν Κόρην θυγατέρα τοῦ Διὸς ἔφασαν. Καὶ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν δὲ ὁμοίως πονηρευόμενοι θυγατέρα τοῦ Διὸς ἔφασαν, οὐκ ἀπὸ μίξεως, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ ἐννοηθέντα τὸν Θεὸν διὰ λόγου τὸν κόσμον ποιῆσαι ἔγνωσαν, ὡς τὴν πρώτην Ἔννοιαν ἔφασαν τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν· ὅπερ γελοιότατον ἡγούμεθα εἶναι, τῆς ἐννοίας εἰκόνα παραφέρειν θηλειῶν μορφήν. Καὶ ὁμοίως τοὺς ἄλλους λεγομένους υἱοὺς τοῦ Διὸς αἱ πράξεις ἐλέγχουσιν.*

Returning to his subject, Justin describes the order of celebrating the Eucharist, and the first communion of those newly baptised.

LXV. *Ἡμεῖς δὲ μετὰ τὸ οὕτως λοῦσαι τὸν πεπεισμένον καὶ συγκατατεθειμένον, ἐπὶ τοὺς λεγομένους ἀδελφοὺς ἄγομεν, ἔνθα συνηγμένοι εἰσὶ, κοινὰς εὐχὰς ποιησόμενοι ὑπέρ τε ἑαυτῶν, καὶ τοῦ φωτισθέντος, καὶ ἄλλων πανταχοῦ πάν-*

LXIV. 5. *ὡς προεγράψαμεν.* The reference is to c. 59, where Gen. i. 1, 2, has been previously cited.

12. *ἐννοηθέντα. Having been impressed with the idea on his mind.* The import of the participle will be readily conceived by Bishop Kaye's remarks on a corresponding notion entertained by Tatian. See his Justin, p. 164.

LXV. 2. *ἐπὶ τοὺς λεγομένους ἀδελφούς.* Tertul. Apol. c. 39, *Fratres autem etiam vestri sumus, jure naturæ matris unius: at quanto dignius fratres et dicuntur et habentur, qui unum patrem Deum agnoverunt, qui unum spiritum biberunt sanctitatis, qui de uno utero ignorantiæ ejusdem ad unam lucem aspirarunt veritatis.*

3. *κοινὰς εὐχάς.* So called, because offered up in the common assembly, and in the common behalf of all sorts and conditions of men. Tertull. Apol. c. 39, *Coimus in cœtum et congregationem, ut ad Deum, quasi manu facta, precationibus ambiamus. Hæc vis Deo grata est. Oramus etiam pro imperatoribus, pro ministris eorum et potestatibus, pro statu sæculi, pro rerum quiete, pro mora finis.* Arnob. c. Gent. IV. *In quibus,* scil. *conventibus, summus oretur Deus, pax cunctis et venia postuletur magistratibus, exercitibus, regibus, familiaribus, inimicis.* Similar passages abound in the early writers. For specimens of these prayers, see the Constt. Apost. VIII. 9 sqq.

των εὐτόνως, ὅπως καταξιωθῶμεν, τὰ ἀληθῆ μαθόντες, καὶ δι' ἔργων ἀγαθοὶ πολιτευταὶ καὶ φύλακες τῶν ἐντεταλμένων εὑρεθῆναι, ὅπως τὴν αἰώνιον σωτηρίαν σωθῶμεν. Ἀλλήλους φιλήματι ἀσπαζόμεθα παυσάμενοι τῶν εὐχῶν. Ἔπειτα προσφέρεται τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος, καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος· καὶ οὗτος λαβὼν αἶνον καὶ δόξαν

6. ἀγαθοὶ πολιτευταί. *Good citizens.* Compare Acts xxiii. 1; Phil. i. 27, iii. 20; and see the Commentators on ll. cc.

7. ἀλλήλους φιλήματι ἀσπαζόμεθα. This token of Christian love was grounded on the Apostolic form of salutation (Rom. xvi. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 12; *et al.*), and appears to have been given at the close of the ordinary worship, before the celebration of the Eucharist. It was not, however, interchanged between persons of different sexes; and every precaution was taken to prevent abuses, to which the practice might possibly give rise. The enemies of Christianity, however, made it a ground of calumny against the brethren, and therefore it was gradually abolished; though vestiges of it are found even as late as the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. See Apost. Const. VIII. 11; Athenag. Legat. c. 32; Clem. Alex. Pæd. III. 11; Tertull. ad Uxor. II. 4; de Orat. c. 14; Origen. Comment. ad Rom. x. 33; Jerom. Epist. 62; Cyril. Hier. Cat. Myst. c. 5; Augustin. Serm. 83; Chrysost. de Compunct. Cord. I. 3; Concil. Laod. Can. 19.

9. τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδ. That is, it should seem, *to the Bishop.* Ignat. Epist. ad Smyrn. c. 8, ἐκείνη βεβαία εὐχαριστία ἡγείσθω, ἡ ὑπὸ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ οὖσα, ἢ ᾧ ἂν αὐτὸς ἐπιτρέψῃ. Tertull. de Cor. Mil. c. 3, *Eucharistiæ sacramentum non de aliorum manu, quam* Præsidentium, *sumimus.* It was the prevailing rule in the early Church that the elements should be consecrated by the bishop, if he were present, and, in his absence only, by the presbyter. This office is assigned in the Constt. Apost. (VIII. 13), either to the ἀρχιερεὺς or the ἐπίσκοπος. A presbyter distributed the bread, and a deacon the cup. In the New Test. the titles προϊστάμενος and προεστὼς seem to indicate *a bishop* or *presiding presbyter*, indifferently. Compare Rom. xii. 8; 1 Thess. v. 12; 1 Tim. v. 17. Thus Tertull. Apol. c. 39, *Præsident in Ecclesia probati quidam seniores, honorem istum non pretio sed testimonio adepti.* Cyprian. Epist. 27, *In literis quas collegæ nostri ad* episcopos *in Numidia* præsidentes *ante fecerunt.* Basil. Hom. in Ps. xxviii. 1, οἱ τῆς ποίμνης τοῦ Χριστοῦ προεστῶτες.

9. ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος. For ὕδατος οἴνῳ κεκραμένου. In the primitive Church the sacramental wine was always mixed with a small quantity of water; and this mixture the Greeks called κρᾶμα (from κεράννυμι), and the Latins *temperamentum calicis* or *calicem mixtūm.* See Iren. Hær. I. 9; IV. 57; V. 2, 36. It was in fact deemed equally heretical to use wine alone as water alone; and the *Armenians* and the *Encratites* were alike condemned for either practice respectively. See Clem. Alex. Pæd. II. 2; Epiphan. Hær. XLVI. 4, 16; Augustin. Hær. 64; Theod. Hær. Fab. I. 20. Writing to Cæcilius against the latter practice, Cyprian (Epist. 63) not only maintains that wine is essential to the sacrament, but seems to regard the tempering of the wine with water as sanctioned by our Lord himself, and supposes that the mixture is emblematical of a mystical union between Christ and the Church, which is dissolved by the absence of either ingredient. Ambrose again explains

τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων, διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, ἀναπέμπει, καὶ εὐχαριστίαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατηξιῶσθαι τούτων παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πολὺ ποιεῖται· οὗ συντελέσαντος τὰς εὐχὰς καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν, πᾶς ὁ παρὼν λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ λέγων, Ἀμήν. Τὸ δὲ Ἀμὴν τῇ Ἑβραΐδι φωνῇ τὸ Γένοιτο σημαίνει. Εὐχαριστήσαντος δὲ τοῦ προεστῶτος, καὶ ἐπευφημήσαντος παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ, οἱ καλούμενοι παρ' ἡμῖν διάκονοι διδόασιν ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσιν ἀποφέρουσι.

LXVI. Καὶ ἡ τροφὴ αὕτη καλεῖται παρ' ἡμῖν Εὐχαριστία· ἧς οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ μετασχεῖν ἐξόν ἐστιν, ἢ τῷ πιστεύοντι

He points out the nature of the sacrament, and the manner of its institution; and adverts to the imitation of it in the mysteries of *Mithras*.

the matter thus, in his treatise *de Sacrament.* v. 1: *Quid sibi vult admixtio aquæ? Quia de latere Christi profluxit sanguis et aqua, ut redimeret. Quare de latere? Quia unde culpa, inde gratia: culpa per fœminam, gratia per dominum Jesum Christum.* Though it is probable, however, that the cup which our Saviour used contained water as well as wine, according to the prevailing custom of the Jews; and although the custom was not only authorized by early usage, but decreed by the third Council of Carthage (c. 23) and other synods, it was rejected at the Reformation as built upon no Scriptural warrant, as not representing any part of the sacrament as ordained by Christ, and as having given rise to a variety of idle questions prejudicial to the peace of the Church. With respect to the practice of the Church of England, see Wheatley *on the Common Prayer*, VI. 10, 5; Palmer's *English Ritual*, IV. 9; and Bingham's *Antiq.* XV. 27.

13. ἐπὶ πολύ. *At considerable length.* Chrysost. in 1 Cor. Hom. 24, οὐ μικρὸν τὸ εἰρημένον· εὐλογίαν γὰρ ὅταν εἴπω, πάντα ἀναπτύσσω τὸν τῆς εὐεργεσίας τοῦ Θεοῦ θησαυρὸν, καὶ τῶν μεγάλων ἐκείνων ἀναμιμνήσκω δωρεῶν.

15. Ἀμήν. See Constt. Apost. VIII. 10; Cyril. H. Cat. c. 5; Euseb. H. E. VI. 43; Ambros. de Sacrament. IV. 4; Jerom. Epist. 62. Of the word itself, see the Commentt. on Matt. vi. 13.

19. καὶ οἴνου. A positive testimony, that in Justin's time the sacrament was administered *in both kinds* to the laity as well as clergy: nor was the custom ever varied till the 12th century, when the cup was gradually withdrawn from the people in the Western Church.

20. τοῖς οὐ παροῦσιν ἀποφέρουσι. Persons, who from sickness or other causes were unable to attend, were regarded as present in spirit and sympathy; and portions of the consecrated elements were sent to the invalid or to the imprisoned, in order that they might partake of the benefits of communion. See Bp. Kaye's Justin, IV. 92. That the bread and wine were in these cases also administered alike, Jerome bears testimony in Epist. 4, *Nihil illo ditius, qui corpus Domini canistro vimineo, sanguinem portat in vitro.* Hence it should seem that at this period the bread was distributed from a wicker basket.

LXVI. 1. εὐχαριστία. This was a very early appellation of the Lord's Supper, founded no doubt upon the word applied to the *eucharistic* act of Christ himself at the institution of the sacrament (Matt. xxvi. 27; Mark xiv. 23; Luke xxii. 19;

ἀληθῆ εἶναι τὰ δεδιδαγμένα ὑφ' ἡμῶν, καὶ λουσαμένῳ τὸ ὑπὲρ ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ εἰς ἀναγέννησιν λουτρὸν, καὶ οὕτως βιοῦντι ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς παρέδωκεν. Οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον οὐδὲ κοινὸν πόμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν· ἀλλ' ὃν τρόπον διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ σαρκοποιηθεὶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ἔσχεν, οὕτως καὶ τὴν δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφὴν, ἐξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σάρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν

1 Cor. xi. 24), and inculcating the necessity of thankfulness for the divine mercy as an indispensable qualification in those who partake of it. Origen. c. Cels. VIII., *ἔστι σύμβολον ἡμῖν τῆς πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν εὐχαριστίας ἄρτος Εὐχαριστία καλούμενος*. See also Iren. Hær. IV. 34; Clem. Alex. Pæd. II. 2; Chrysost. in Matt. Hom. 25.

6. *ὃν τρόπον κ. τ. λ.* The difficulties attending the interpretation of this passage are unquestionably great; and Romanists, Lutherans, and the Reformed Church are equally earnest in alleging it in support of their respective systems. Possibly a close analysis will be the best means of eliciting the writer's sentiments. In the first place, *διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ*, and *δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ* are palpably opposed to each other; and it is generally admitted that the former must be understood of the *Divine Word* or second person of the Trinity, and the latter of the prayer pronounced by Christ at the institution of the Eucharist, of which the *prayer of consecration* afterwards supplied the place. Of the expressions themselves, see above or cc. 13, 3; 33, 26; 46. Secondly, although Justin plainly supposes *a real presence* of Christ in the supper, his Benedictine editor, Bellarmine, Le Nourry, and others, altogether fail in securing his support to the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*. He asserts indeed that the consecrated elements are not received as *common bread and wine*, but, at the same time, he speaks of them as substantially bread and wine: and his argument seems to be, that as the human nature—flesh and blood—were united in the incarnate Saviour, so the bread and wine are, by the act of communion, united with the body and blood of Christ spiritually present, and, by a transmutation of our corruptible nature, nourish it into a capability for life eternal. It would seem therefore that as the bread and wine, according to our author's notion, undergoes no physical change, his testimony would be more plausibly urged in favour of *Consubstantiation;* but even this alternative is set aside by the fact that he elsewhere speaks of the elements as figurative emblems, regarding them as simply commemorative of the body and blood of Christ. See Dial. Tryph. cc. 41, 70. As to the expression *κατὰ μεταβολὴν*, it is better referred to *αἷμα καὶ σάρκες ἡμῶν* than to *τρέφονται*; and the sense, as given above, is confirmed by the views of the rite entertained by other writers. Thus Ignat. Epist. ad Ephes. c. 20, *ἕνα ἄρτον κλῶντες, ὅ ἐστι φάρμακον ἀθανασίας, ἀντίδοτος τοῦ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν, ἀλλὰ ζῆν ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ διὰ παντός*. Iren. Hær. IV. 34, *ὡς ὁ ἀπὸ γῆς ἄρτος, προσλαμβανόμενος τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐκέτι κοινὸς ἄρτος ἐστὶν, ἀλλ' εὐχαριστία ἐκ δύο πραγμάτων συνεστηκυῖα, ἐπιγείου τε καὶ οὐρανίου· οὕτως καὶ τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν, μεταλαμβάνοντα τῆς εὐχαριστίας, μηκέτι εἶναι φθαρτὰ, τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς εἰς αἰῶνας ἀναστάσεως ἔχοντα*. See also Bishop Kaye's Justin, IV. pp. 87, 93.

τρέφονται ἡμῶν, ἐκείνου τοῦ σαρκοποιηθέντος Ἰησοῦ καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ἐδιδάχθημεν εἶναι. Οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται Εὐαγγέλια, οὕτως παρέδωκαν ἐντετάλθαι αὐτοῖς· τὸν Ἰησοῦν, λαβόντα ἄρτον, εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν, Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησίν μου, τοῦτ' ἔστι τὸ σῶμά μου· καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὁμοίως λαβόντα, καὶ εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν, Τοῦτ' ἔστι τὸ αἷμά μου· καὶ μόνοις αὐτοῖς μεταδοῦναι. Ὅπερ καὶ ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Μίθρα μυστηρίοις παρέδωκαν γίνεσθαι μιμησάμενοι οἱ πονηροὶ δαίμονες. Ὅτι γὰρ ἄρτος καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος τίθεται ἐν ταῖς τοῦ μυουμένου τελεταῖς μετ' ἐπιλόγων τινῶν, ἢ ἐπίστασθε, ἢ μαθεῖν δύνασθε.

Thence he proceeds to give an account of the ordinary assemblies of Christians on the *Sunday;* and states the reason for the selection of this particular day for the most solemn purposes of religious worship.

LXVII. Ἡμεῖς δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα λοιπὸν ἀεὶ τούτων ἀλλήλους ἀναμιμνήσκομεν. Καὶ οἱ ἔχοντες τοῖς λειπομένοις πᾶσιν ἐπικουροῦμεν, καὶ σύνεσμεν ἀλλήλοις ἀεί. Ἐπὶ πᾶσί τε οἷς προσφερόμεθα, εὐλογοῦμεν τὸν ποιητὴν τῶν πάντων διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ διὰ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου. Καὶ τῇ τοῦ Ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγροὺς μενόντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται, καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκεται, μέχρις ἐγχωρεῖ. Εἶτα

13. ἃ καλεῖται Εὐαγγέλια. There is neither reason nor authority for rejecting these words as an interpolation. See Bishop Kaye, as cited above on c. 33, 22. In what follows, the ordinary punctuation is, ἐντετάλθαι αὐτοῖς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, κ. τ. λ. Both the construction and the sense appear to require the change which has been adopted; though none of the editors have hitherto noticed the manifest harshness which the text, as commonly pointed, exhibits. The scriptural references are Matt. xxvi. 26, 28; Mark xiv. 22; Luke xxii. 19, 20. For τοῦτ' ἔστι τὸ σῶμά μου, Braunius has τοῦτό ἐστι. *Vulgo* τουτέστι.

19. τοῖς τοῦ Μίθρα μ. Compare Tertull. *de præscr. hær.* c. 40. Of the worship of Mithras, see Tzschirner's *Fall des Heidenthums*, I. 77, 125; Creuzer's *Symbol. und Mythol. der alten Völker*, tom. I. pp. 728 sqq., 759 sqq.

LXVII. 3. ἐπὶ πᾶσί τε οἷς προσφ. See on c. 13, 3.

6. τῇ τοῦ Ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ κ. τ. λ. See Tertull. Apol. c. 16; de fuga in Pers. *sub fine;* Plin. Epist. x. 97.

8. καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα κ. τ. λ. In the early Christian church the form of worship was closely modelled upon that of the Jews, and the reading of the Scriptures, comprising now the New Testament as well as the Old, formed an essential part of it. Rules for reading them are laid down in the Apostolical Constitutions; and several of the Fathers, as well as the decrees of Councils, enforce the practice as the foundation of all religious service. It appears from this passage of Justin, whose testimony is supported by that of Tertullian and Cyprian,

παυσαμένου τοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος, ὁ προεστὼς διὰ λόγου τὴν νουθεσίαν καὶ πρόκλησιν τῆς τῶν καλῶν τούτων μιμήσεως ποιεῖται. Ἔπειτα ἀνιστάμεθα κοινῇ πάντες, καὶ εὐχὰς πέμπομεν· καί, ὡς προέφημεν, παυσαμένων ἡμῶν τῆς εὐχῆς, ἄρτος προσφέρεται καὶ οἶνος καὶ ὕδωρ, καὶ ὁ προεστὼς εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας, ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ, ἀναπέμπει, καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ λέγων τὸ Ἀμήν· καὶ ἡ διάδοσις καὶ ἡ μετάληψις ἀπὸ τῶν εὐχαριστηθέντων ἑκάστῳ γίνεται, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσι διὰ τῶν διακόνων πέμπεται. Οἱ εὐποροῦντες δὲ καὶ βουλόμενοι κατὰ προαίρεσιν ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ, ὃ βούλεται, δίδωσι· καὶ τὸ συλλεγόμενον παρὰ

that a distinct officer was appointed to this service; and the form of his ordination is described by the latter writer. As a general rule, the canonical Scriptures alone were read in the public assemblies; but the Apocryphal writings and other religious works were recommended for private perusal; and, on certain occasions, the writings of distinguished pastors and teachers were read aloud in particular churches. Such were the *Shepherd of* Hermas, the *first Epistle* of Clement of Rome to the *Corinthians*, the *Homilies* of Chrysostom and others, and the *Acts* of Martyrs and Saints. See Apost. Constt. II. 25, 57, 59, VIII. 5; Tertull. Apol. c. 39; de Anim. c. 9; ad Uxor. II. 6; de Præscr. Hær. c. 41; Cyprian. Epist. 34; Origen. c. Cels. III. 45, 50; Chrysost. ad Hebr. Hom. 8; Concil. Laod. c. 59; Carthag. III. c. 47; Chalced. cc. 13, 14; Euseb. H. E. III. 16, IV. 23, VI. 14; Augustin. de Sanct. Serm. 12. After the lesson, Justin states that the presiding minister, ὁ προεστὼς, admonished the people in an address, and exhorted them to imitate the good actions therein recorded. Compare Tertull. Apol. c. 39; Constt. Apost. II. 57, 58.

11. πρόκλησιν. This word occurs above in c. 3, 35, but in a very different acceptation. Grabe, Thalemann, and Braunius would here read παράκλησιν, which clearly yields a far more convenient sense. Otto is averse from any change; but gives *adhortationem* in his Latin version.

13. ὡς προέφημεν. In c. 65, the first communion of the newly baptized is described; and here, the ordinary administration of the sacrament on Sundays. Of the changes which had taken place since the time of the Apostles, see Bishop Kaye's Justin, ch. 4, p. 91.

15. ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ. See above on c. 13, 4. Grabe cites the following Eucharistic formula from the Constt. Apost. VIII. 12, εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, Θεὲ παντοκράτορ, οὐχ ὅσον ὀφείλομεν, ἀλλ' ὅσον δυνάμεθα.

18. οἱ εὐποροῦντες κ. τ. λ. Tertull. Apol. c. 39, *Modicum unusquisque stipem menstrua die, vel quum velit, et si modo velit, et si modo possit, apponit: nam nemo compellitur, sed sponte confert. Hæc quasi deposita pietatis sunt. Nam inde non epulis, non potaculis, nec ingratis voratrinis dispensatur; sed egenis alendis humandisque, et pueris ac puellis re ac parentibus destitutis, jamque domesticis senibus, item naufragis, et si qui in metallis, et si qui in insulis, vel in custodiis, duntaxat ex causa Dei sectæ, alumni confessionis suæ fiunt.* See also on c. 14, 13.

20. παρὰ τῷ προεστῶτι ἀποτίθεται. See Bp. Kaye's Justin, ch. 4, p. 98.

τῷ προεστῶτι ἀποτίθεται, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπικουρεῖ ὀρφανοῖς τε καὶ χήραις, καὶ τοῖς διὰ νόσον ἢ δι' ἄλλην αἰτίαν λειπομένοις, καὶ τοῖς ἐν δεσμοῖς οὖσι, καὶ τοῖς παρεπιδήμοις οὖσι ξένοις, καὶ ἁπλῶς πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν χρείᾳ οὖσι κηδεμὼν γίνεται. Τὴν δὲ τοῦ Ἡλίου ἡμέραν κοινῇ πάντες τὴν συνέλευσιν ποιούμεθα, ἐπειδὴ πρώτη ἐστὶν ἡμέρα, ἐν ᾗ ὁ Θεὸς τὸ σκότος καὶ τὴν ὕλην τρέψας κόσμον ἐποίησε, καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ ἡμέτερος σωτὴρ τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνέστη. Τῇ γὰρ πρὸ τῆς Κρονικῆς ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν· καὶ τῇ μετὰ τὴν Κρονικήν, ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἡλίου ἡμέρα, φανεὶς τοῖς ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ μαθηταῖς ἐδίδαξε ταῦτα, ἅπερ εἰς ἐπίσκεψιν καὶ ὑμῖν ἀνεδώκαμεν.

In conclusion, Justin appeals to the candour and justice of the Emperors, resigns the cause of Christianity into the hands of God, and subjoins a rescript of Adrian in their favour.

LXVIII. Καὶ εἰ μὲν δοκεῖ ὑμῖν λόγου καὶ ἀληθείας ἔχεσθαι, τιμήσατε αὐτά· εἰ δὲ λῆρος ὑμῖν δοκεῖ, ὡς ληρωδῶν πραγμάτων καταφρονήσατε, καὶ μή, ὡς κατ' ἐχθρῶν, κατὰ τῶν μηδὲν ἀδικούντων θάνατον ὁρίζετε. Προλέγομεν γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐκ ἐκφεύξεσθε τὴν ἐσομένην τοῦ Θεοῦ κρίσιν, ἐὰν ἐπιμένητε τῇ ἀδικίᾳ· καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐπιβοήσομεν, Ὃ φίλον τῷ Θεῷ, τοῦτο γενέσθω. Καὶ ἐξ ἐπιστολῆς δὲ

25. τὴν δὲ τοῦ Ἡλίου ἡμέραν κ. τ. λ. So Iren. Hær. v. 23, *Dominus venit ad passionem pridiè ante sabbatum, quæ est sexta conditionis dies, in qua homo plasmatus est.* With respect to Justin's language in this passage, it has been thought that he preferred substituting ἡ πρὸ τῆς Κρονικῆς for ἡ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ἡμέρα, because of the mythological infamy of *Venus*; but probably he merely spoke in the usual phraseology of his time. See a learned Essay on the *Names of the Days of the Week* in the first volume of the *Philological Museum*, and Bp. Kaye, *ubi supra.*

27. τρέψας. In c. 59, 3, στρέψαντα. Both readings may stand, without either interfering with the other.

LXVIII. 1. καὶ εἰ μὲν δοκεῖ ὑμῖν κ. τ. λ. As a nominative repeat, from the end of the last chapter, ταῦτα, ἅπερ εἰς ἐπίσκεψιν καὶ ὑμῖν ἀνεδώκαμεν.

7. ὃ φίλον κ. τ. λ. The margins of both the MSS. have the following *var. lect.*, ὡς τῷ Θεῷ φίλον, ταύτῃ γενέσθω. There are many similar expressions of resignation in Scripture, which Justin had probably in view. Compare 1 Sam. iii. 18; Matt. xxvi. 39.

7. καὶ ἐξ ἐπιστολῆς. *Vulgo* ἀποστολῆς. The true reading is given by Eusebius (H. E. IV. 8), who has transcribed the passage, with a few other variations to be noted below. The historian observes that, as Justin had given the rescript of Adrian in the original Latin, he had substituted a Greek translation of it: αὐτὴν παρατεθεῖται τὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν ἀντιγραφήν, ἡμεῖς δ' ἐπὶ τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν κατὰ δύναμιν αὐτὴν μετειλήφαμεν. All the editions, however, exhibit the Eusebian version, with the exception of that of Otto, who places the Latin original, as preserved by Rufinus, in the text, and appends the Greek translation to the Latin version. In the present edition, the rescript itself and the Greek paraphrase

τοῦ μεγίστου καὶ ἐπιφανεστάτου Καίσαρος Ἀδριανοῦ, τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν, ἔχοντες ἀπαιτεῖν ὑμᾶς καθὰ ἠξιώσαμεν κελεῦσαι τὰς κρίσεις γενέσθαι, οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ κεκρῖσθαι τοῦτο ὑπὸ Ἀδριανοῦ μᾶλλον ἠξιώσαμεν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ ἐπίστασθαι δίκαια ἀξιοῦν τὴν προσφώνησιν καὶ ἐξήγησιν πεποιήμεθα. Ὑπετάξαμεν δὲ καὶ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς Ἀδριανοῦ τὸ ἀντίγραφον, ἵνα καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο ἀληθεύειν ἡμᾶς γνωρίζητε. Καί ἐστι τὸ ἀντίγραφον τοῦτο·

The Rescript of *Adrian* in behalf of the Christians.

Adriani pro Christianis Rescriptum.

Accepi literas ad me scriptas a decessore tuo, *Serenio Graniano*, clarissimo viro; et non placet mihi relationem silentio præterire, ne et innoxii perturbentur, et calumniatoribus latrocinandi tribuatur occasio. Itaque si evidenter provinciales huic petitioni suæ adesse valent adversum Christianos, ut pro

Ἀδριανοῦ ὑπὲρ Χριστιανῶν ἐπιστολή.

Μινουκίῳ Φουνδανῷ. Ἐπιστολὴν ἐδεξάμην γραφεῖσάν μοι ἀπὸ Σερηνίου Γρανιανοῦ, λαμπροτάτου ἀνδρὸς, ὅντινα σὺ διεδέξω. Οὐ δοκεῖ οὖν μοι τὸ πρᾶγμα ἀζήτητον καταλιπεῖν, ἵνα μήτε οἱ ἄνθρωποι ταράττωνται, καὶ τοῖς συκοφάνταις χορηγία κακουργίας παρασχεθῇ. Ἂν οὖν σαφῶς

appear in parallel columns. Of the genuineness of the document, which is attested both by Justin and Eusebius, no reasonable doubt can be entertained. To most editions of the Apology, however, two other papers are appended: of which the former, an edict addressed by Antoninus Pius to the common assembly of Asia, is in all probability spurious; the latter, an epistle of Marcus Antoninus to the Roman senate, in which he ascribes his success in the German war to the prayers of the Christians, is unquestionably so. Neither of these documents are mentioned by Justin, but were clearly added by a later hand. Had the former, which has been wrongly ascribed to Marcus Aurelius, been in existence in Justin's time, he would surely have appealed to it rather than to the rescript of Adrian, as being an act of the very Emperor to whom his Apology is addressed. Were the latter written by Marcus Antoninus, Justin was dead long before the occurrence of the event to which it relates. Nevertheless it has been thought advisable to retain them as usual appendages to this Apology, not as necessarily connected with the Apology itself.

10. *τὰς κρίσεις γενέσθαι κ. τ. λ.* Euseb. *τὰς κρ. γίνεσθαι, τοῦτο οὐχ ὡς ὑπὸ Ἀδριανοῦ κελευσθὲν μᾶλλον ἠξιώσαμεν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ ἐπιστ. δικαίαν ἀξιοῦν τὴν πρ. Ὑπετάξαμεν κ. τ. λ.* In what follows the preposition *κατὰ* is omitted; and the concluding words of the paragraph are, *Καὶ ἔστι τόδε.*

Rescript of Adrian. 3. *Σερηνίου.* Euseb. *Σερεννίου.*

5. *οὖν μοι.* These words are transposed by Eusebius.

10. *ἂν οὖν σαφῶς κ. τ. λ.* Euseb. *εἰ οὖν σαφῶς εἰς τ. τ. ἀ. οἱ ἐπαρχιῶται δύνανται κ. τ. λ.* The MSS. and many editions have *ἐπαρχειῶται.* For *ἀποκρίνεσθαι*, Eusebius has *ἀποκρίνασθαι.*

tribunali eos in aliquo arguant, hoc eis exequi non prohibeo. Precibus autem in hoc solis et acclamationibus uti, eis non permitto. Etenim multo æquius est, si quis volet accusare, te cognoscere de objectis. Si quis igitur accusat et probat adversum leges quodquam agere memoratos homines, pro merito peccatorum etiam supplicia statues. Illud mehercule magnopere curabis, ut si qui calumniæ gratia quemquam horum postulaverit reum, in hunc pro sua nequitia suppliciis sævioribus vindices.

εἰς ταύτην τὴν ἀξίωσιν οἱ ἐπαρχιῶται δύνωνται διϊσχυρίζεσθαι κατὰ τῶν Χριστιανῶν, ὡς καὶ πρὸ βήματος ἀποκρίνεσθαι, ἐπὶ τοῦτο μόνον τραπῶσιν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀξιώσεσιν, οὐδὲ μόναις βοαῖς. Πολλῷ γὰρ μᾶλλον προσῆκεν, εἴ τις κατηγορεῖν βούλοιτο, τοῦτό σε διαγινώσκειν. Εἴ τις οὖν κατηγορεῖ, καὶ δείκνυσί τι παρὰ τοὺς νόμους πράττοντας, οὕτως διόριζε κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ ἁμαρτήματος. Ὡς μὰ τὸν Ἡρακλέα, εἴ τις συκοφαντίας χάριν τοῦτο προτείνοι, διαλάμβανε ὑπὲρ τῆς δεινότητος, καὶ φρόντιζε ὅπως ἂν ἐκδικήσειας.

Ἀντωνίνου ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν τῆς Ἀσίας.

Edict of Antoninus Pius to the Common Assembly of Asia.

Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Τίτος Αἴλιος Ἀδριανὸς Ἀντωνῖνος Σεβαστὸς, Εὐσεβὴς, ἀρχιερεὺς μέγιστος, δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ ιέ, ὕπατος τὸ γ', πατὴρ πατρίδος, τῷ κοινῷ τῆς Ἀσίας χαίρειν. Ἐγὼ ᾤμην ὅτι καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ἐπιμελεῖς ἔσεσθαι μὴ λανθάνειν τοὺς τοιούτους. Πολὺ γὰρ μᾶλλον ἐκείνους κολάσοιεν, εἴπερ δύναιντο, τοὺς μὴ βουλομένους αὐτοῖς προσκυνεῖν. Οἷς ταραχὴν ὑμεῖς ἐμβάλλετε, καὶ τὴν

17. βοαῖς. This alludes to those shouts and acclamations, such as *Christiani ad leones*, by which the populace demanded the death of the Christians; and to which the provincial governors were either too ready to yield, or too powerless to resist. See Epist. Smyrn. de Mart. Polycarp., and Epist. Mart. Lugd. et Vienn. ap. Euseb. H. E. IV. 15, V. 1; Tertul. Apol. c. 40; de Resurr. c. 22; ad. Nat. I. 9; Cyprian. Epist. 55, 81.

23. διόριζε. Euseb. ὅριζε.

EDICT OF ANT. PIUS. πρὸς τὸ κοινόν. *Scil.* συνέδριον. Of these provincial assemblies, see Valesius on Eusebius, who has also cited this Edict in connexion with Adrian's rescript. In a document, manifestly out of place, and more than probably spurious, it is needless to record those various readings which do not affect the sense.

2. δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας. *The Tribuneship.*—3. ὕπατος. *Consul.*

των εὐτόνως, ὅπως καταξιωθῶμεν, τὰ ἀληθῆ μαθόντες, καὶ δι' ἔργων ἀγαθοὶ πολιτευταὶ καὶ φύλακες τῶν ἐντεταλμένων εὑρεθῆναι, ὅπως τὴν αἰώνιον σωτηρίαν σωθῶμεν. Ἀλλήλους φιλήματι ἀσπαζόμεθα παυσάμενοι τῶν εὐχῶν. Ἔπειτα προσφέρεται τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος, καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος· καὶ οὗτος λαβὼν αἶνον καὶ δόξαν

6. *ἀγαθοὶ πολιτευταί. Good citizens.* Compare Acts xxiii. 1; Phil. i. 27, iii. 20; and see the Commentators on ll. cc.

7. *ἀλλήλους φιλήματι ἀσπαζόμεθα.* This token of Christian love was grounded on the Apostolic form of salutation (Rom. xvi. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 12; *et al.*), and appears to have been given at the close of the ordinary worship, before the celebration of the Eucharist. It was not, however, interchanged between persons of different sexes; and every precaution was taken to prevent abuses, to which the practice might possibly give rise. The enemies of Christianity, however, made it a ground of calumny against the brethren, and therefore it was gradually abolished; though vestiges of it are found even as late as the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. See Apost. Const. VIII. 11; Athenag. Legat. c. 32; Clem. Alex. Pæd. III. 11; Tertull. ad Uxor. II. 4; de Orat. c. 14; Origen. Comment. ad Rom. x. 33; Jerom. Epist. 62; Cyril. Hier. Cat. Myst. c. 5; Augustin. Serm. 83; Chrysost. de Compunct. Cord. I. 3; Concil. Laod. Can. 19.

9. *τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδ.* That is, it should seem, *to the Bishop.* Ignat. Epist. ad Smyrn. c. 8, *ἐκείνη βεβαία εὐχαριστία ἡγείσθω, ἡ ὑπὸ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ οὖσα, ἢ ᾧ ἂν αὐτὸς ἐπιτρέψῃ.* Tertull. de Cor. Mil. c. 3, *Eucharistiæ sacramentum non de aliorum manu, quam* Præsidentium, *sumimus.* It was the prevailing rule in the early Church that the elements should be consecrated by the bishop, if he were present, and, in his absence only, by the presbyter. This office is assigned in the Constt. Apost. (VIII. 13), either to the *ἀρχιερεὺς* or the *ἐπίσκοπος.* A presbyter distributed the bread, and a deacon the cup. In the New Test. the titles *προϊστάμενος* and *προεστὼς* seem to indicate *a bishop* or *presiding presbyter,* indifferently. Compare Rom. xii. 8; 1 Thess. v. 12; 1 Tim. v. 17. Thus Tertull. Apol. c. 39, *Præsident in Ecclesia probati quidam seniores, honorem istum non pretio sed testimonio adepti.* Cyprian. Epist. 27, *In literis quas collegæ nostri ad* episcopos *in Numidia* præsidentes *ante fecerunt.* Basil. Hom. in Ps. xxviii. 1, *οἱ τῆς ποίμνης τοῦ Χριστοῦ προεστῶτες.*

9. *ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος.* For *ὕδατος οἴνῳ κεκραμένου.* In the primitive Church the sacramental wine was always mixed with a small quantity of water; and this mixture the Greeks called *κρᾶμα* (from *κεράννυμι*), and the Latins *temperamentum calicis* or *calicem mixtūm.* See Iren. Hær. I. 9; IV. 57; V. 2, 36. It was in fact deemed equally heretical to use wine alone as water alone; and the *Armenians* and the *Encratites* were alike condemned for either practice respectively. See Clem. Alex. Pæd. II. 2; Epiphan. Hær. XLVI. 4, 16; Augustin. Hær. 64; Theod. Hær. Fab. I. 20. Writing to Cæcilius against the latter practice, Cyprian (Epist. 63) not only maintains that wine is essential to the sacrament, but seems to regard the tempering of the wine with water as sanctioned by our Lord himself, and supposes that the mixture is emblematical of a mystical union between Christ and the Church, which is dissolved by the absence of either ingredient. Ambrose again explains

τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων, διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, ἀναπέμπει, καὶ εὐχαριστίαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατηξιῶσθαι τούτων παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πολὺ ποιεῖται· οὗ συντελέσαντος τὰς εὐχὰς καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν, πᾶς ὁ παρὼν λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ λέγων, Ἀμήν. Τὸ δὲ Ἀμὴν τῇ Ἑβραΐδι φωνῇ τὸ Γένοιτο σημαίνει. Εὐχαριστήσαντος δὲ τοῦ προεστῶτος, καὶ ἐπευφημήσαντος παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ, οἱ καλούμενοι παρ' ἡμῖν διάκονοι διδόασιν ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσιν ἀποφέρουσι.

LXVI. Καὶ ἡ τροφὴ αὕτη καλεῖται παρ' ἡμῖν Εὐχαριστία· ἧς οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ μετασχεῖν ἐξόν ἐστιν, ἢ τῷ πιστεύοντι

He points out the nature of the sacrament, and the manner of its institution; and adverts to the imitation of it in the mysteries of *Mithras*.

the matter thus, in his treatise *de Sacrament.* v. 1: *Quid sibi vult admixtio aquæ? Quia de latere Christi profluxit sanguis et aqua, ut redimeret. Quare de latere? Quia unde culpa, inde gratia: culpa per fœminam, gratia per dominum Jesum Christum.* Though it is probable, however, that the cup which our Saviour used contained water as well as wine, according to the prevailing custom of the Jews; and although the custom was not only authorized by early usage, but decreed by the third Council of Carthage (c. 23) and other synods, it was rejected at the Reformation as built upon no Scriptural warrant, as not representing any part of the sacrament as ordained by Christ, and as having given rise to a variety of idle questions prejudicial to the peace of the Church. With respect to the practice of the Church of England, see Wheatley *on the Common Prayer*, VI. 10, 5; Palmer's *English Ritual*, IV. 9; and Bingham's *Antiq.* XV. 27.

13. ἐπὶ πολύ. *At considerable length.* Chrysost. in 1 Cor. Hom. 24, οὐ μικρὸν τὸ εἰρημένον· εὐλογίαν γὰρ ὅταν εἴπω, πάντα ἀναπτύσσω τὸν τῆς εὐεργεσίας τοῦ Θεοῦ θησαυρὸν, καὶ τῶν μεγάλων ἐκείνων ἀναμιμνήσκω δωρεῶν.

15. Ἀμήν. See Constt. Apost. VIII. 10; Cyril. H. Cat. c. 5; Euseb. H. E. VI. 43; Ambros. de Sacrament. IV. 4; Jerom. Epist. 62. Of the word itself, see the Commentt. on Matt. vi. 13.

19. καὶ οἴνου. A positive testimony, that in Justin's time the sacrament was administered *in both kinds* to the laity as well as clergy: nor was the custom ever varied till the 12th century, when the cup was gradually withdrawn from the people in the Western Church.

20. τοῖς οὐ παροῦσιν ἀποφέρουσι. Persons, who from sickness or other causes were unable to attend, were regarded as present in spirit and sympathy; and portions of the consecrated elements were sent to the invalid or to the imprisoned, in order that they might partake of the benefits of communion. See Bp. Kaye's Justin, IV. 92. That the bread and wine were in these cases also administered alike, Jerome bears testimony in Epist. 4, *Nihil illo ditius, qui corpus Domini canistro vimineo, sanguinem portat in vitro.* Hence it should seem that at this period the bread was distributed from a wicker basket.

LXVI. 1. εὐχαριστία. This was a very early appellation of the Lord's Supper, founded no doubt upon the word applied to the *eucharistic* act of Christ himself at the institution of the sacrament (Matt. xxvi. 27; Mark xiv. 23; Luke xxii. 19;

ἀληθῆ εἶναι τὰ δεδιδαγμένα ὑφ' ἡμῶν, καὶ λουσαμένῳ τὸ ὑπὲρ ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ εἰς ἀναγέννησιν λουτρὸν, καὶ οὕτως βιοῦντι ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς παρέδωκεν. Οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον οὐδὲ κοινὸν πόμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν· ἀλλ' ὃν τρόπον διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ σαρκοποιηθεὶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ἔσχεν, οὕτως καὶ τὴν δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφὴν, ἐξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σάρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν

1 Cor. xi. 24), and inculcating the necessity of thankfulness for the divine mercy as an indispensable qualification in those who partake of it. Origen. c. Cels. VIII., ἔστι σύμβολον ἡμῖν τῆς πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν εὐχαριστίας ἄρτος Εὐχαριστία καλούμενος. See also Iren. Hær. IV. 34; Clem. Alex. Pæd. II. 2; Chrysost. in Matt. Hom. 25.

6. ὃν τρόπον κ. τ. λ. The difficulties attending the interpretation of this passage are unquestionably great; and Romanists, Lutherans, and the Reformed Church are equally earnest in alleging it in support of their respective systems. Possibly a close analysis will be the best means of eliciting the writer's sentiments. In the first place, διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ, and δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ are palpably opposed to each other; and it is generally admitted that the former must be understood of the *Divine Word* or second person of the Trinity, and the latter of the prayer pronounced by Christ at the institution of the Eucharist, of which the *prayer of consecration* afterwards supplied the place. Of the expressions themselves, see above or cc. 13, 3; 33, 26; 46. Secondly, although Justin plainly supposes *a real presence* of Christ in the supper, his Benedictine editor, Bellarmine, Le Nourry, and others, altogether fail in securing his support to the doctrine of *Transubstantiation.* He asserts indeed that the consecrated elements are not received as *common bread and wine,* but, at the same time, he speaks of them as substantially bread and wine: and his argument seems to be, that as the human nature—flesh and blood—were united in the incarnate Saviour, so the bread and wine are, by the act of communion, united with the body and blood of Christ spiritually present, and, by a transmutation of our corruptible nature, nourish it into a capability for life eternal. It would seem therefore that as the bread and wine, according to our author's notion, undergoes no physical change, his testimony would be more plausibly urged in favour of *Consubstantiation;* but even this alternative is set aside by the fact that he elsewhere speaks of the elements as figurative emblems, regarding them as simply commemorative of the body and blood of Christ. See Dial. Tryph. cc. 41, 70. As to the expression κατὰ μεταβολὴν, it is better referred to αἷμα καὶ σάρκες ἡμῶν than to τρέφονται; and the sense, as given above, is confirmed by the views of the rite entertained by other writers. Thus Ignat. Epist. ad Ephes. c. 20, ἕνα ἄρτον κλῶντες, ὅ ἐστι φάρμακον ἀθανασίας, ἀντίδοτος τοῦ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν, ἀλλὰ ζῆν ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ διὰ παντός. Iren. Hær. IV. 34, ὡς ὁ ἀπὸ γῆς ἄρτος, προσλαμβανόμενος τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐκέτι κοινὸς ἄρτος ἐστὶν, ἀλλ' εὐχαριστία ἐκ δύο πραγμάτων συνεστηκυῖα, ἐπιγείου τε καὶ οὐρανίου· οὕτως καὶ τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν, μεταλαμβάνοντα τῆς εὐχαριστίας, μηκέτι εἶναι φθαρτὰ, τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς εἰς αἰῶνας ἀναστάσεως ἔχοντα. See also Bishop Kaye's Justin, IV. pp. 87, 93.

τρέφονται ἡμῶν, ἐκείνου τοῦ σαρκοποιηθέντος Ἰησοῦ καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ἐδιδάχθημεν εἶναι. Οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται Εὐαγγέλια, οὕτως παρέδωκαν ἐντετάλθαι αὐτοῖς· τὸν Ἰησοῦν, λαβόντα ἄρτον, εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν, Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησίν μου, τοῦτ' ἔστι τὸ σῶμά μου· καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὁμοίως λαβόντα, καὶ εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν, Τοῦτ' ἔστι τὸ αἷμά μου· καὶ μόνοις αὐτοῖς μεταδοῦναι. Ὅπερ καὶ ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Μίθρα μυστηρίοις παρέδωκαν γίνεσθαι μιμησάμενοι οἱ πονηροὶ δαίμονες. Ὅτι γὰρ ἄρτος καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος τίθεται ἐν ταῖς τοῦ μυουμένου τελεταῖς μετ' ἐπιλόγων τινῶν, ἢ ἐπίστασθε, ἢ μαθεῖν δύνασθε.

LXVII. Ἡμεῖς δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα λοιπὸν ἀεὶ τούτων ἀλλήλους ἀναμιμνήσκομεν. Καὶ οἱ ἔχοντες τοῖς λειπομένοις πᾶσιν ἐπικουροῦμεν, καὶ σύνεσμεν ἀλλήλοις ἀεί. Ἐπὶ πᾶσί τε οἷς προσφερόμεθα, εὐλογοῦμεν τὸν ποιητὴν τῶν πάντων διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ διὰ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου. Καὶ τῇ τοῦ Ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγροὺς μενόντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται, καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκεται, μέχρις ἐγχωρεῖ. Εἶτα

Thence he proceeds to give an account of the ordinary assemblies of Christians on the *Sunday;* and states the reason for the selection of this particular day for the most solemn purposes of religious worship.

13. ἃ καλεῖται Εὐαγγέλια. There is neither reason nor authority for rejecting these words as an interpolation. See Bishop Kaye, as cited above on c. 33, 22. In what follows, the ordinary punctuation is, ἐντετάλθαι αὐτοῖς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, κ. τ. λ. Both the construction and the sense appear to require the change which has been adopted; though none of the editors have hitherto noticed the manifest harshness which the text, as commonly pointed, exhibits. The scriptural references are Matt. xxvi. 26, 28; Mark xiv. 22; Luke xxii. 19, 20. For τοῦτ' ἔστι τὸ σῶμά μου, Braunius has τοῦτό ἐστι. *Vulgo* τουτέστι.

19. τοῖς τοῦ Μίθρα μ. Compare Tertull. *de præscr. hær.* c. 40. Of the worship of Mithras, see Tzschirner's *Fall des Heidenthums*, I. 77, 125; Creuzer's *Symbol. und Mythol. der alten Völker*, tom. I. pp. 728 sqq., 759 sqq.

LXVII. 3. ἐπὶ πᾶσί τε οἷς προσφ. See on c. 13, 3.

6. τῇ τοῦ Ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ κ. τ. λ. See Tertull. Apol. c. 16; de fuga in Pers. *sub fine;* Plin. Epist. x. 97.

8. καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα κ. τ. λ. In the early Christian church the form of worship was closely modelled upon that of the Jews, and the reading of the Scriptures, comprising now the New Testament as well as the Old, formed an essential part of it. Rules for reading them are laid down in the Apostolical Constitutions; and several of the Fathers, as well as the decrees of Councils, enforce the practice as the foundation of all religious service. It appears from this passage of Justin, whose testimony is supported by that of Tertullian and Cyprian,

παυσαμένου τοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος, ὁ προεστὼς διὰ λόγου τὴν νουθεσίαν καὶ πρόκλησιν τῆς τῶν καλῶν τούτων μιμήσεως ποιεῖται. Ἔπειτα ἀνιστάμεθα κοινῇ πάντες, καὶ εὐχὰς πέμπομεν· καί, ὡς προέφημεν, παυσαμένων ἡμῶν τῆς εὐχῆς, ἄρτος προσφέρεται καὶ οἶνος καὶ ὕδωρ, καὶ ὁ προεστὼς εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας, ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ, ἀναπέμπει, καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ λέγων τὸ Ἀμήν· καὶ ἡ διάδοσις καὶ ἡ μετάληψις ἀπὸ τῶν εὐχαριστηθέντων ἑκάστῳ γίνεται, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσι διὰ τῶν διακόνων πέμπεται. Οἱ εὐποροῦντες δὲ καὶ βουλόμενοι κατὰ προαίρεσιν ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ, ὃ βούλεται, δίδωσι· καὶ τὸ συλλεγόμενον παρὰ

that a distinct officer was appointed to this service; and the form of his ordination is described by the latter writer. As a general rule, the canonical Scriptures alone were read in the public assemblies; but the Apocryphal writings and other religious works were recommended for private perusal; and, on certain occasions, the writings of distinguished pastors and teachers were read aloud in particular churches. Such were the *Shepherd of* Hermas, the *first Epistle* of Clement of Rome to the *Corinthians*, the *Homilies* of Chrysostom and others, and the *Acts* of Martyrs and Saints. See Apost. Constt. II. 25, 57, 59, VIII. 5; Tertull. Apol. c. 39; de Anim. c. 9; ad Uxor. II. 6; de Præscr. Hær. c. 41; Cyprian. Epist. 34; Origen. c. Cels. III. 45, 50; Chrysost. ad Hebr. Hom. 8; Concil. Laod. c. 59; Carthag. III. c. 47; Chalced. cc. 13, 14; Euseb. H. E. III. 16, IV. 23, VI. 14; Augustin. de Sanct. Serm. 12. After the lesson, Justin states that the presiding minister, ὁ προεστώς, admonished the people in an address, and exhorted them to imitate the good actions therein recorded. Compare Tertull. Apol. c. 39; Constt. Apost. II. 57, 58.

11. πρόκλησιν. This word occurs above in c. 3, 35, but in a very different acceptation. Grabe, Thalemann, and Braunius would here read παράκλησιν, which clearly yields a far more convenient sense. Otto is averse from any change; but gives *adhortationem* in his Latin version.

13. ὡς προέφημεν. In c. 65, the first communion of the newly baptized is described; and here, the ordinary administration of the sacrament on Sundays. Of the changes which had taken place since the time of the Apostles, see Bishop Kaye's Justin, ch. 4, p. 91.

15. ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ. See above on c. 13, 4. Grabe cites the following Eucharistic formula from the Constt. Apost. VIII. 12, εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, Θεὲ παντοκράτορ, οὐχ ὅσον ὀφείλομεν, ἀλλ' ὅσον δυνάμεθα.

18. οἱ εὐποροῦντες κ. τ. λ. Tertull. Apol. c. 39, *Modicum unusquisque stipem menstrua die, vel quum velit, et si modo velit, et si modo possit, apponit: nam nemo compellitur, sed sponte confert. Hæc quasi deposita pietatis sunt. Nam inde non epulis, non potaculis, nec ingratis voratrinis dispensatur; sed egenis alendis humandisque, et pueris ac puellis re ac parentibus destitutis, jamque domesticis senibus, item naufragis, et si qui in metallis, et si qui in insulis, vel in custodiis, duntaxat ex causa Dei sectæ, alumni confessionis suæ fiunt.* See also on c. 14, 13.

20. παρὰ τῷ προεστῶτι ἀποτίθεται. See Bp. Kaye's Justin, ch. 4, p. 98.

τῷ προεστῶτι ἀποτίθεται, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπικουρεῖ ὀρφανοῖς τε καὶ χήραις, καὶ τοῖς διὰ νόσον ἢ δι' ἄλλην αἰτίαν λειπομένοις, καὶ τοῖς ἐν δεσμοῖς οὖσι, καὶ τοῖς παρεπιδήμοις οὖσι ξένοις, καὶ ἁπλῶς πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν χρείᾳ οὖσι κηδεμὼν γίνεται. Τὴν δὲ τοῦ Ἡλίου ἡμέραν κοινῇ πάντες τὴν συνέλευσιν ποιούμεθα, ἐπειδὴ πρώτη ἐστὶν ἡμέρα, ἐν ᾗ ὁ Θεὸς τὸ σκότος καὶ τὴν ὕλην τρέψας κόσμον ἐποίησε, καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ ἡμέτερος σωτὴρ τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνέστη. Τῇ γὰρ πρὸ τῆς Κρονικῆς ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν· καὶ τῇ μετὰ τὴν Κρονικήν, ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἡλίου ἡμέρα, φανεὶς τοῖς ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ μαθηταῖς ἐδίδαξε ταῦτα, ἅπερ εἰς ἐπίσκεψιν καὶ ὑμῖν ἀνεδώκαμεν.

In conclusion, Justin appeals to the candour and justice of the Emperors, resigns the cause of Christianity into the hands of God, and subjoins a rescript of Adrian in their favour.

LXVIII. Καὶ εἰ μὲν δοκεῖ ὑμῖν λόγου καὶ ἀληθείας ἔχεσθαι, τιμήσατε αὐτά· εἰ δὲ λῆρος ὑμῖν δοκεῖ, ὡς ληρωδῶν πραγμάτων καταφρονήσατε, καὶ μή, ὡς κατ' ἐχθρῶν, κατὰ τῶν μηδὲν ἀδικούντων θάνατον ὁρίζετε. Προλέγομεν γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐκ ἐκφεύξεσθε τὴν ἐσομένην τοῦ Θεοῦ κρίσιν, ἐὰν ἐπιμένητε τῇ ἀδικίᾳ· καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐπιβοήσομεν, Ὃ φίλον τῷ Θεῷ, τοῦτο γενέσθω. Καὶ ἐξ ἐπιστολῆς δὲ

25. τὴν δὲ τοῦ Ἡλίου ἡμέραν κ. τ. λ. So Iren. Hær. v. 23, *Dominus venit ad passionem pridiè ante sabbatum, quæ est sexta conditionis dies, in qua homo plasmatus est.* With respect to Justin's language in this passage, it has been thought that he preferred substituting ἡ πρὸ τῆς Κρονικῆς for ἡ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ἡμέρα, because of the mythological infamy of *Venus;* but probably he merely spoke in the usual phraseology of his time. See a learned Essay on the *Names of the Days of the Week* in the first volume of the *Philological Museum*, and Bp. Kaye, *ubi supra.*

27. τρέψας. In c. 59, 3, στρέψαντα. Both readings may stand, without either interfering with the other.

LXVIII. 1. καὶ εἰ μὲν δοκεῖ ὑμῖν κ. τ. λ. As a nominative repeat, from the end of the last chapter, ταῦτα, ἅπερ εἰς ἐπίσκεψιν καὶ ὑμῖν ἀνεδώκαμεν.

7. ὃ φίλον κ. τ. λ. The margins of both the MSS. have the following *var. lect.*, ὡς τῷ Θεῷ φίλον, ταύτῃ γενέσθω. There are many similar expressions of resignation in Scripture, which Justin had probably in view. Compare 1 Sam. iii. 18; Matt. xxvi. 39.

7. καὶ ἐξ ἐπιστολῆς. *Vulgo* ἀποστολῆς. The true reading is given by Eusebius (H. E. IV. 8), who has transcribed the passage, with a few other variations to be noted below. The historian observes that, as Justin had given the rescript of Adrian in the original Latin, he had substituted a Greek translation of it: αὐτὴν παρατεθεῖται τὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν ἀντιγραφήν, ἡμεῖς δ' ἐπὶ τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν κατὰ δύναμιν αὐτὴν μετειλήφαμεν. All the editions, however, exhibit the Eusebian version, with the exception of that of Otto, who places the Latin original, as preserved by Rufinus, in the text, and appends the Greek translation to the Latin version. In the present edition, the rescript itself and the Greek paraphrase

τοῦ μεγίστου καὶ ἐπιφανεστάτου Καίσαρος Ἀδριανοῦ, τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν, ἔχοντες ἀπαιτεῖν ὑμᾶς καθὰ ἠξιώσαμεν κελεῦσαι τὰς κρίσεις γενέσθαι, οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ κεκρῖσθαι τοῦτο ὑπὸ Ἀδριανοῦ μᾶλλον ἠξιώσαμεν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ ἐπίστασθαι δίκαια ἀξιοῦν τὴν προσφώνησιν καὶ ἐξήγησιν πεποιήμεθα. Ὑπετάξαμεν δὲ καὶ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς Ἀδριανοῦ τὸ ἀντίγραφον, ἵνα καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο ἀληθεύειν ἡμᾶς γνωρίζητε. Καί ἐστι τὸ ἀντίγραφον τοῦτο·

The Rescript of *Adrian* in behalf of the Christians.

Adriani pro Christianis Rescriptum.

Accepi literas ad me scriptas a decessore tuo, *Serenio Graniano*, clarissimo viro; et non placet mihi relationem silentio præterire, ne et innoxii perturbentur, et calumniatoribus latrocinandi tribuatur occasio. Itaque si evidenter provinciales huic petitioni suæ adesse valent adversum Christianos, ut pro

Ἀδριανοῦ ὑπὲρ Χριστιανῶν ἐπιστολή.

Μινουκίῳ Φουνδανῷ. Ἐπιστολὴν ἐδεξάμην γραφεῖσάν μοι ἀπὸ Σερηνίου Γρανιανοῦ, λαμπροτάτου ἀνδρός, ὅντινα σὺ διεδέξω. Οὐ δοκεῖ οὖν μοι τὸ πρᾶγμα ἀζήτητον καταλιπεῖν, ἵνα μήτε οἱ ἄνθρωποι ταράττωνται, καὶ τοῖς συκοφάνταις χορηγία κακουργίας παρασχεθῇ. Ἂν οὖν σαφῶς

appear in parallel columns. Of the genuineness of the document, which is attested both by Justin and Eusebius, no reasonable doubt can be entertained. To most editions of the Apology, however, two other papers are appended: of which the former, an edict addressed by Antoninus Pius to the common assembly of Asia, is in all probability spurious; the latter, an epistle of Marcus Antoninus to the Roman senate, in which he ascribes his success in the German war to the prayers of the Christians, is unquestionably so. Neither of these documents are mentioned by Justin, but were clearly added by a later hand. Had the former, which has been wrongly ascribed to Marcus Aurelius, been in existence in Justin's time, he would surely have appealed to it rather than to the rescript of Adrian, as being an act of the very Emperor to whom his Apology is addressed. Were the latter written by Marcus Antoninus, Justin was dead long before the occurrence of the event to which it relates. Nevertheless it has been thought advisable to retain them as usual appendages to this Apology, not as necessarily connected with the Apology itself.

10. *τὰς κρίσεις γενέσθαι κ. τ. λ.* Euseb. *τὰς κρ. γίνεσθαι, τοῦτο οὐχ ὡς ὑπὸ Ἀδριανοῦ κελευσθὲν μᾶλλον ἠξιώσαμεν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ ἐπιστ. δικαίαν ἀξιοῦν τὴν πρ. Ὑπετάξαμεν κ. τ. λ.* In what follows the preposition *κατὰ* is omitted; and the concluding words of the paragraph are, *Καὶ ἔστι τόδε.*

Rescript of Adrian. 3. *Σερηνίου.* Euseb. *Σερεννίου.*

5. *οὖν μοι.* These words are transposed by Eusebius.

10. *ἂν οὖν σαφῶς κ. τ. λ.* Euseb. *εἰ οὖν σαφῶς εἰς τ. τ. ἀ. οἱ ἐπαρχιῶται δύνανται κ. τ. λ.* The MSS. and many editions have *ἐπαρχεῶται.* For *ἀποκρίνεσθαι*, Eusebius has *ἀποκρίνασθαι.*

tribunali eos in aliquo arguant, hoc eis exequi non prohibeo. Precibus autem in hoc solis et acclamationibus uti, eis non permitto. Etenim multo æquius est, si quis volet accusare, te cognoscere de objectis. Si quis igitur accusat et probat adversum leges quodquam agere memoratos homines, pro merito peccatorum etiam supplicia statues. Illud mehercule magnopere curabis, ut si qui calumniæ gratia quemquam horum postulaverit reum, in hunc pro sua nequitia suppliciis sævioribus vindices.

εἰς ταύτην τὴν ἀξίωσιν οἱ ἐπαρχιῶται δύνωνται διϊσχυρίζεσθαι κατὰ τῶν Χριστιανῶν, ὡς καὶ πρὸ βήματος ἀποκρίνεσθαι, ἐπὶ τοῦτο μόνον τραπῶσιν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀξιώσεσιν, οὐδὲ μόναις βοαῖς. Πολλῷ γὰρ μᾶλλον προσῆκεν, εἴ τις κατηγορεῖν βούλοιτο, τοῦτό σε διαγινώσκειν. Εἴ τις οὖν κατηγορεῖ, καὶ δείκνυσί τι παρὰ τοὺς νόμους πράττοντας, οὕτως διόριζε κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ ἁμαρτήματος. Ὡς μὰ τὸν Ἡρακλέα, εἴ τις συκοφαντίας χάριν τοῦτο προτείνοι, διαλάμβανε ὑπὲρ τῆς δεινότητος, καὶ φρόντιζε ὅπως ἂν ἐκδικήσειας.

Ἀντωνίνου ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν τῆς Ἀσίας.

Edict of Antoninus Pius to the Common Assembly of Asia.

Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Τίτος Αἴλιος Ἀδριανὸς Ἀντωνῖνος Σεβαστὸς, Εὐσεβὴς, ἀρχιερεὺς μέγιστος, δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ ιέ, ὕπατος τὸ γ', πατὴρ πατρίδος, τῷ κοινῷ τῆς Ἀσίας χαίρειν. Ἐγὼ ᾤμην ὅτι καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ἐπιμελεῖς ἔσεσθαι μὴ λανθάνειν τοὺς τοιούτους. Πολὺ γὰρ μᾶλλον ἐκείνους κολάσοιεν, εἴπερ δύναιντο, τοὺς μὴ βουλομένους αὐτοῖς προσκυνεῖν. Οἷς ταραχὴν ὑμεῖς ἐμβάλλετε, καὶ τὴν

17. *βοαῖς.* This alludes to those shouts and acclamations, such as *Christiani ad leones*, by which the populace demanded the death of the Christians; and to which the provincial governors were either too ready to yield, or too powerless to resist. See Epist. Smyrn. de Mart. Polycarp., and Epist. Mart. Lugd. et Vienn. ap. Euseb. H. E. IV. 15, V. 1; Tertul. Apol. c. 40; de Resurr. c. 22; ad. Nat. I. 9; Cyprian. Epist. 55, 81.

23. *διόριζε.* Euseb. *ὅριζε.*

EDICT OF ANT. PIUS. *πρὸς τὸ κοινόν.* *Scil. συνέδριον.* Of these provincial assemblies, see Valesius on Eusebius, who has also cited this Edict in connexion with Adrian's rescript. In a document, manifestly out of place, and more than probably spurious, it is needless to record those various readings which do not affect the sense.

2. *δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας.* *The Tribuneship.*—3. *ὕπατος.* *Consul.*

αὐτοὺς, ὅπερ οὐκ ἔπρεπε, διὰ τὸ ὕστερον ἐπεγνωκέναι με τὴν δύναμιν αὐτῶν. Ὅθεν ἀρξάμενοι, οὐ βελῶν παράρτησιν οὔτε ὅπλων οὔτε σαλπίγγων, διὰ τὸ ἐχθρὸν εἶναι τὸ τοιοῦτο αὐτοῖς, διὰ τὸν Θεὸν ὃν φοροῦσι κατὰ συνείδησιν. Εἰκὸς οὖν ἐστιν, οὓς ὑπολαμβάνομεν ἀθέους εἶναι, ὅτι Θεὸν ἔχουσιν αὐτόματον ἐν τῇ συνειδήσει τετειχισμένον. Ῥίψαντες γὰρ ἑαυτοὺς ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, οὐχ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ μόνον ἐδεήθησαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ παρόντος στρατεύματος, παρήγορον γενέσθαι δίψης καὶ λιμοῦ τῆς παρούσης. Πεμπταῖοι γὰρ ὕδωρ οὐκ εἰλήφειμεν διὰ τὸ μὴ παρεῖναι· ἦμεν γὰρ ἐν τῷ μεσομφάλῳ τῆς Γερμανίας καὶ τοῖς ὅροις αὐτῶν. Ἅμα δὲ τῷ τούτους ῥίψαι ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἑαυτοὺς, καὶ εὔχεσθαι Θεῷ, ᾧ ἐγὼ ἠγνόουν, εὐθέως ὕδωρ ἠκολούθει οὐρανόθεν, ἐπὶ μὲν ἡμᾶς ψυχρότατον, ἐπὶ δὲ τοὺς Ῥωμαίων ἐπιβούλους χάλαζα πυρώδης. Ἀλλὰ καὶ εὐθὺ Θεοῦ παρουσίαν ἐν εὐχῇ γινομένην παραυτίκα, ὡς ἀνυπερβλήτου καὶ ἀκαταλύτου. Αὐτόθεν οὖν ἀρξάμενοι συγχωρήσωμεν τοῖς τοιούτοις εἶναι Χριστιανοῖς, ἵνα μὴ καθ' ἡμῶν τι τοιοῦτον αἰτησάμενοι ὅπλον, ἐπιτύχωσι. Τὸν δὲ τοιοῦτον συμβουλεύω, διὰ τὸ τοιοῦτον εἶναι Χριστιανὸν, μὴ ἐγκαλεῖσθαι. Εἰ δὲ εὑρεθείη τις ἐγκαλῶν τῷ Χριστιανῷ, ὅτι Χριστιανός ἐστι, τὸν μὲν προσαγόμενον Χριστιανὸν πρόδηλον εἶναι βούλομαι, γίνεσθαι

21. ὅθεν ἀρξάμενοι κ. τ. λ. There appears to be some corruption in the text; but the meaning is not difficult to elicit. The Christians began the battle, not with their weapons, but with prayers to God. In the next sentence ὅτι is inserted before Θεὸν at the suggestion of Sylburg, and with the approbation of Otto.

27. τοῦ παρόντος στρ. Sylburg and Thirlby would read πάντος; and παρήγορον, with reference to Θεὸν, is the emendation of Scaliger for παρήγοροι.

28. πεμπταῖοι. *During five days.* Compare Herod. VI. 106; Xen. Cyr. v. 22; John xi. 39; Acts xxviii. 13.

30. αὐτῶν. That is, of the Germans; the name of the *people* being latent in that of the country. See Matth. Gr. Gr. §. 435. For similar constructions in the New Test. see Matt. iv. 23, ix. 35; Luke iv. 15; Acts viii. 5, xx. 2.

31. Θεῷ, ᾧ ἐγὼ ἠγνόουν. Compare Acts xvii. 23.

32. εὐθέως ὕδωρ κ. τ. λ. For an account of the *Thundering Legion*, as it is called, and a lucid examination of the question respecting the probability of the occurrence, see Bishop Kaye on Tertullian, p. 106.

34. Θεοῦ παρουσίαν κ. τ. λ. *Deest* συνείδομεν, *vel aliud consimile verbum.* SYLBURG.

40. τὸν μὲν προσαγόμενον κ. τ. λ. The following seems to be the *ordo verborum:* βούλομαι τὸν μὲν προσαγόμενον Χρ., ὁμολογήσαντα τοῦτο γίνεσθαι, πρόδηλον εἶναι ἐγκαλούμενον ἄλλο ἕτερον μηδὲν, κ. τ. λ.

ὁμολογήσαντα τοῦτο, ἄλλο ἕτερον μηδὲν ἐγκαλούμενον, ἢ ὅτι Χριστιανός ἐστι μόνον· τὸν προσάγοντα δὲ τοῦτον ζῶντα καίεσθαι· τὸν δὲ Χριστιανὸν ὁμολογήσαντα, καὶ συνασφαλισάμενον περὶ τοῦ τοιούτου, τὸν πεπιστευμένον τὴν ἐπαρχίαν εἰς μετάνοιαν καὶ ἀνελευθερίαν τὸν τοιοῦτον μὴ μετάγειν. Ταῦτα δὲ καὶ τῆς συγκλήτου δόγματι κυρωθῆναι βούλομαι, καὶ κελεύω τοῦτό μου τὸ διάταγμα ἐν τῷ φόρῳ τοῦ Τραϊανοῦ προτεθῆναι, πρὸς τὸ δύνασθαι ἀναγινώσκεσθαι. Φροντίσει ὁ πραίφεκτος Βιτράσιος Πολλίων εἰς τὰς πέριξ ἐπαρχίας πεμφθῆναι· πάντα δὲ τὸν βουλόμενον χρῆσθαι καὶ ἔχειν, μὴ κωλύεσθαι λαμβάνειν ἐκ τῶν προτεθέντων παρ' ἡμῶν.

50. *ὁ πραίφεκτος.* The Latin *præfectus.* After *φροντίσει* Sylburg supposes that the particles *δὲ καὶ* have been omitted.

50. *Βιτράσιος. Vulgo* Βήρασιος. *Vitrasia* is a name found in Ælius Lampridius; whence the emendation, admitted by Otto into the text, is sufficiently confirmed.

INDICES.

I.—GENERAL INDEX OF MATTERS BOTH IN TEXT AND NOTES.

B

C

L

M

N

O

P

II.—GREEK WORDS AND PHRASES.

III.—TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE.

APOCRYPHA.

NEW TEST.

CAMBRIDGE:
PRINTED BY METCALFE AND PALMER, TRINITY STREET.